NATIONAL ANTI-SLAVERY STANDARD.

Without Concealment-----Without Compromise.

VOLUME VII.—NO. 46. NEW-YORK, THURSDAY, APRIL 15, 1847. WHOLE NUMBER 358.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY,
BY THE
AMERICAN A. S. SOCIETY.
At 142 Nassau Street, New-York.

SYDNEY HOWARD GAY, Editor.

☞ All communications for the paper, and letters relating to its pecuniary concerns, should be addressed to the Editor.

☞ Donations to the Treasury of the American Anti-Slavery Society may be forwarded to FRANCIS JACKSON, Treasurer, at Boston; or to S. H. Gay, Assistant Treasurer, at New-York.

TERMS.—One Dollar per annum: Strictly in advance in all cases.

H. M. HENRY, PRINTER.

Selections.

From the New-Bedford Evening Bulletin.

DELAWARE AND SLAVERY.

We resume our remarks on the subject of Slavery in connection with the recent movements in Delaware. We propose to trace the causes of this action backward, and to spend no time in discussing the question in its general relations to the progress of the world; but to point out some of the *specific and palpable* causes which have led to this result. And we shall name at once, as among the most prominent, if not foremost of them all, *discussion*; and discussion, too, by professed and devoted *Abolitionists*. We are not among the followers, or eulogists of those men who, for the last twelve years have been considered the leaders in the abolition movement—we confess that we have had little sympathy in the measures they have adopted. We think they have been extravagant, and have sadly overdone their work, doubtless, thus, marring it. But their zeal has been the zeal of a high and holy devotion to a great and noble cause, and we can pardon something of what we believe to be fanaticism in one who gives evidence of having at heart, and all unselfishly, the good of his fellow-creatures.

We can bring to mind but one reformer who ever appeared on the earth, that was not subject to the same charge—but He was *divine*, and not so short-sighted and impatient as some of his followers. Luther was full of bitter invective, and Roger Williams would in these days be called a rabid come-outer. And William L. Garrison is—to use the mildest term consistent with our view of him—extravagant and one-sided. But for all that, his name will live, written in letters of gold, when his detractors and their children's children shall have passed forever into oblivion. We believe that to him more than any other man, belongs the credit of having given an impulse to the cause of abolition, which shall never grow weaker, but constantly stronger and stronger until the foul blot of human slavery shall be wiped out from the fair tablets of our nation's history and glory.

We have often heard the people say, and many a *dough-faced* press has reiterated the charge, that William Lloyd Garrison was a selfish man, having private and sinister aims, and that his whole course has been hypocritical and knavish. Of what good man, whoever took a prominent stand in favour of human redemption, and advocated Liberty with a bold and fearless tongue, has not the same been said? But those who utter these calumnies, are either totally ignorant of the history of this great man, or are as incapable of understanding his large soul as they are of appreciating his noble labours. His early history gives the lie to these vile accusations. He was one of the first who felt the evil, and determined to devote the exalted energies which God had blessed him withal, to remedy it. Educated in a printing office, where the record of the wrongs of Slavery came constantly before his eyes, he there conceived the idea of establishing a paper devoted to the poor and forgotten millions who were bound in the degrading and accursed chains of bondage. So moved was his nature to this noble work that he thought no personal sacrifice too large, or costly, that he might carry out his truly Christian purposes. He sought sympathy, but found it not; he asked for aid and it was denied him; he was foretold with prophetic truth the scorn and hatred and bitter persecution which would be meted out to him in payment for his devotion; but none of these things deterred, or moved him. In spite of obloquy and hate, and a persecution which stopped short only of his life, he began his work. He took lodgings in a miserable garret, and fed only on bread and water, that he might accomplish it, working at the case and press, day and night, untiring and unterrified.

It needs not that we should record his shame and suffering, it is known to the world, and many a man feels his cheek now tingle with shame at the part which he took in the senseless war which was waged against his person and his press. Nor need we record his triumph—God has taken care that it shall not die out of the memory of the good forever.

But we did not intend an eulogy on the man whose name figures so largely in this article—we could not help saying what we have. It has been our aim to show, what every thoughtful man must perceive, that the recent glorious manifestations in Delaware, are only a part of the fruit—the first apparent fruits—which is already whitening the field of humanity, and which is just to be gathered in to the joy of the world, and to the glory of the men who amidst all storms of opposition and outrage have carried forward the great work of human freedom, and which some have sealed with their blood.

We say again, we have not and cannot approve all their doings—we think that they have erred in spirit and in deed—let him cast the first stone who has not—but we have small patience with certain men, who have never lifted the burden from the shoulders of their suffering fellow-beings with one of their fingers, who yet sit complacently in their easy chairs, and pour out the basest vituperations upon men whose shoe-latchet they are unworthy to loose; and whose sole reason is that their political, or personal interests are utterly opposed to human progress and human comfort, unless it shall bring with it to their party, or their purse, profit and strength.

From the Liberator.

THE DISUNION PETITIONS.

The Judiciary Committee of the Legislature of this State, to whom were referred the petitions for a peaceable secession from the Union, have made their report—that the petitioners have leave to withdraw. The Committee did not venture to grapple with the reasons for this secession, set forth in the petitions, because they cannot be successfully refuted. Each one of them is vital and impregnable. If they could have been answered, we are confident that answer would have been given, and with signal ability; for the chairman, Mr. Bell, is a man of much intellectual power and legal acumen. While we did not expect a favourable response to the prayer of the petitioners, at this stage of public sentiment on the question of dissolution, we were led to hope that the Committee would make a report, that would cause the ears of the slaveholding usurpers to tingle, and admonish them that if Massachusetts was not yet ready for secession, it was not because she had not ample justification for so doing, in the unconstitutional annexation of Texas—in the seizure and imprisonment of her coloured seamen in Southern ports—in the lawless treatment of her official representatives, Messrs. Hoar and Hubbard—in the thousand tyrannical acts of the South; but only because her forbearance was not utterly exhausted, nor her hope of redress wholly extinguished. The petitioners will withdraw, but only to appear at another session with greatly augmented forces. They are earnest men and women, who mean what they say, who are not to be turned aside from their purpose, and who have no doubt as to the final result. Their motto—"*No Union with Slaveholders!*"—is a glorious one, and will yet be the common watchword throughout the free States.

Communications.

LETTER FROM WILLIAM GOODELL.

HONEOYE, ONTARIO CO. N. Y.
March 29, 1847.

MR. EDITOR:—I cannot admi tthe correctness of your exposition of Mr. Brougham. The language he uses, and the circumstances under which it was uttered, forbid me to understand him as simply denying the *moral* rightfulness of the slaveholder's claim. There was nobody in England to advance *such* a claim, and it was never heard of in this country, until the recent agitation of the subject compelled McDuffie, and Hammond, and a few others, to take that absurd ground. It was not to *such* men, of whom he had never heard, that Mr. Brougham referred, as pleading "the rights of property of the planter in his slaves." No! he referred to men who were far enough from affirming the *moral* right of Slavery in the abstract—men who would have resented such an imputation as an impeachment of their common sense. But, then, they had drank in the common fallacy, that "what the law, [i. e. the civil enactment] makes property, *is* property"—that although it is *morally* wrong, it is, nevertheless, *legally valid!* This, we all know, was the position of the opposers of abolition in England. They pleaded the *legal*, not the *moral* rights of the planters. It was, therefore, the *legal* and NOT the *moral* rights of the planters that such Anti-Slavery lawyers as Brougham had occasion to *deny*. And, in doing this, they only affirmed the correctness of the judicial decision of the Court of King's Bench, in 1772. That decision did not *make* Slavery illegal, nor pretend to do so. On the contrary, it distinctly affirmed that Slavery was not, and never had been legal. It was understood to be simply a *reversal* (or a counter decision) to the previous decisions in favour of the legality of Slavery, declaring all those decisions to have been founded in error. You cannot find, in all England, a lawyer of Brougham's standing, who will admit, *as* a lawyer, that Slavery ever *was* legal in England. Every intelligent and respectable lawyer in England will deny it, and will understand Brougham to have denied it, in the paragraph in question. Try it, and see, if you are incredulous. Mark the language of Brougham. He does not say, "I acknowledge not the *rightfulness* of the property," but "I acknowledge not the *property*." He rejects "the wild and guilty phantasy, that man *can hold property* in man"—*not* that he can "*rightfully*"* do so! He denies that the thing *can be*. And the entire paragraph is almost a literal repetition of those numerous and explicit declarations of *the English Common Law* affirming precisely what I have affirmed, and what Mr. Phillips denies:—that *same* common law which Mr Phillips *admits* to be the death warrant of Slavery, wherever it operates:—and which, therefore, (in contradiction of the high authorities cited by T. D. Weld,) he denies having any binding force in this country, where it has decided so many litigated questions! I never heard that any American Abolitionist ever put any different construction to this oft-repeated paragraph of Brougham, until the illegality of Slavery was made a link in the chain of proof that American Slavery is *unconstitutional*, which conclusion, certain Abolitionists deny. If Brougham did *not* intend to affirm the illegality of Slavery, then he was guilty of making a vain flourish of words to affirm what nobody had denied; to beat down a mere man of straw set up by himself for that purpose.

What the editor of the Tribune may have intended by the quotation, it might be hazardous to conjecture. I would not venture to affirm that Anti-Slavery words mean anything from those who are intent to secure the election of slaveholders to the Presidency. His *language*, however, would seem to imply that he thought Brougham to have been discussing a "*legal*" question. How else could the paragraph avail him anything, in application to "those *legal* quibblers," (not *moral* sophisters,) with whom he was dealing? And how could they be properly called "*legal quibblers*," if their doctrine of the legality of Slavery be the *true doctrine?* Men are not to be stigmatized as "*quibblers*" for reasoning correctly, and maintaining the truth. The reasonings of those "legal quibblers" on both sides the Atlantic, are precisely those of Mr. Phillips, and of the United States Supreme Court, which Mr. Phillips claims as being on his side. If *they* are "legal quibblers," then Mr. Phillips, who cites their authority, who uses their arguments, and arrives at the same conclusions, is a "legal quibbler" likewise. You may say, if you please, that *he* condemns what he believes to be the law, and would have it trampled under foot, while *they* would maintain what they consider to be the law. Be it so. *That* solution only relieves the *morals* and not the *law logic* of Mr. Phillips. If there *are* any "legal quibblers" on this subject, he is one of them, and goes as far as any one can go, in affirming the soundness of their "quibbles."

"In vain," says Brougham, "you tell me of *laws* that sanction such a claim. There *is* a law above all the enactments of human codes,"—mark carefully this language—"In vain you tell me of [*such*] laws"! I do not acknowledge them to *be* laws. "There is a law, above"—above what? "Above all *human laws?*"* No. Mr. Brougham does not say so. "Above all the enactments of human codes." He does not admit them *to be* laws. He will not dignify them with the name. He says, as the common law says, they are to be held "*not* as BAD laws, but as NO laws." This is evidently the meaning of Brougham, and it is the very doctrine I maintain. I do not deny that in a secondary and improper use of the term, we may sometimes speak of "wicked human laws," meaning what are commonly *called* laws, just as we speak of slaveholding Christians. But in all accurate and philosophical disquisitions such ideas can have no place, and the words should be avoided by those who would not confound things opposite in their natures.

But it is time to respond to your question:

"If he (W. Goodell) sincerely believes that Slavery cannot be, in any sense, legal or constitutional, why has he wasted so much time and labour, in an effort to prove that certain clauses of the Constitution are not pro-slavery? Of what consequence is it what the framers of that instrument meant, or the people have understood, or legislation has been predicated upon, or judicial decisions have declared? If he has established his fundamental doctrine, he has done all that is necessary. But does he, or does Mr. Spooner, expect that other men will have any faith in that doctrine, in which they themselves, evidently, have so little, that they write volumes to disprove that which is an absurdity, if the doctrine be true?"

I answer, first, I have not confounded the questions—(quite *distinct*, in my mind, though closely *connected*;) whether Slavery *can* ever, in any country, *be* made legal? Whether it *was* thus legal in England? And whether the Federal Constitution of 1789, legalized Slavery, or recognized it as legal, or attempted to do so. It is a little remarkable that Mr. Phillips (who admits that he never read the whole of my argument) attempts to fix upon me the absurdity of confounding the *first* question with the second and *third*; while *your* question, Mr. Editor, implies that I *ought* to have thus confounded them, and since I *did* not, there is some doubt of my sincerity!

Mr. Phillips will have it that I affirmed the character of the Federal Constitution to be Anti-Slavery, on the ground that justice required it to be so, and that nothing can be constitutional or legal that is contrary to the divine law. In other words, that the Constitution of 1789 *is* Anti-Slavery, because it *ought* to be.

To this misrepresentation I replied, and so successfully, it would seem, that you now "take me upon the other tack," as the seaman's phrase is. If I sincerely believed the *first* position, that Slavery can never be made *legal*, you think I ought to have stopped there, without any particular examination of the Federal *Constitution* at all, because, in establishing the *first* doctrine, I should have done all that was necessary to my argument! I need not "waste any time and labour, in an effort to prove that certain clauses of the Constitution are not pro-slavery." In simply proving the illegality of Slavery, as a general proposition, I should have done up the whole work. All the rest would have followed, of course! Let me commend you to the tender mercies of Wendell Phillips for an answer to this logic. "The clergyman's frequent error" seems to have ascended the editorial chair of the Standard.

2. Be pleased to notice that it might be very proper and useful to prove these two things: first, the general and necessary illegality of Slavery; second, the disagreement of Slavery with the Federal Constitution of 1789. As separate propositions, they were of sufficient importance, either one of them, to justify all the "time and labour" I have bestowed upon them—that is, unless it be a "waste of time and labour" to discuss the subject of Slavery, in its connection with civil government, at all. This would be true, even allowing the two propositions to have no manner of connection or bearing upon each other. [Allowing them to be *identical* propositions, (as you seem to suppose them,) the two distinct ways of proving them might be useful by way of illustration and corroboration. Astronomers prove the roundness of the earth, first by one consideration and then by another. Does it discredit their sincerity because they do not pause at the first argument? Are not some minds reached by one argument, and others by another? Is my sincerity to be questioned, because, by the use of much "time and labour" I have adduced *too many* arguments for the convenience of my opponents? Some men will continue to deny my "fundamental doctrine," as you call it, of the necessary illegality of Slavery, however self-evident it may appear to me. The truth seems too abstract and metaphysical for some minds, educated as they have been. Must I approach them with no *other* argument, without forfeiting my claim to "sincerity?" Not half the people in England will admit that "all men are created equal." Must I, therefore, either give up that doctrine, or else address no *other* anti-slavery argument to them?]

3d. Admitting—what I conceive to be the fact—that the doctrine of the general and necessary illegality of Slavery, is quite *distinct* from the proposition that affirms the Anti-Slavery character of the Constitution of 1789, it may be nevertheless true, (as I think it is,) that the former has a very important *bearing* upon the latter. Let me now make myself understood.

I believe chattel slavery to be essentially and necessarily illegal. This proposition, however, does not, standing alone, by itself, prove the Constitution of 1789, to be an Anti-Slavery document. Taken, however, in connection with other well-established facts and propositions, it *does* enable me to prove conclusively, the Anti-Slavery character of the Constitution of 1789.

Does this statement prove incredible to you? Did you never listen to a demonstration of the 47th proposition of Euclid? You heard a statement of the *first* link of the chain of argument. *That* did not prove the conclusion ultimately reached. Neither did the second, nor the third, nor yet the fourth! But you followed on, to the close, and you was obliged to assent to the conclusion finally reached. And in that chain the first link was not useless, though, *of itself*, it did not demonstrate the problem. You did not turn round, did you? and tell the mathematician that he ought to have stopped, if he were "*sincere*" in his belief of his first postulate, without "wasting so much time and labour," on what followed! *Read* my book through, or read Spooner's, as attentively as you would listen to a demonstration in Euclid, and you will never again repeat such criticisms, or ask questions in this manner. This constitutional question is not the only one upon which men are content to take up with any crude notions that are floating around them, rather than bestow much "time and labour" upon them. The world groans, and humanity faints, because those who undertake to prescribe for their maladies cannot afford "*time and labour*" to understand what is wanting. "Time and labour?" What, I beseech you, was ever done, to good purpose, without them? Most heartily could I wish that nobody would undertake to decide upon the merits of this controversy without the "time and labour" requisite to a full understanding of its several parts.

I supposed I *had* intimated with sufficient distinctness, the place the doctrine of the necessary illegality of Slavery had in my argument. But since I am not understood, let me try my hand at it again.

I take up for examination, the Constitution of 1789. I do not understand it to be the *only* authorized document, setting forth "*American Constitutional law*," as it neither supersedes nor annuls the Declaration of Independence nor the British Common law upon which the Government, as a matter of fact, was founded. The Constitution of 1789 is only an addition to those previously existing elements of our Magna Charta, and is not a *substitute* for them! As a *part* of our authorized declarations of constitutional or organic law, the Constitution of 1789 has to be examined. Is *it* pro-slavery, or is *it* anti-slavery? Neutral it cannot be, for it is impossible.

On examination of the document, I find its declared object, (as in its preamble,) its main features, its organic structure, its fundamental provisions, to be exactly in harmony with our earlier constitutional platforms—our Declaration of Independence—our common law, which no subsequent Convention, Declaration, or Constitution has repealed, or attempted, or professed to repeal. It makes no distinction of colour. It contains no mention nor *description* of slaves nor of Slavery, (as Mr. Weld, long ago, proved.) It guarantees to every State in this Union, a republican form of government. And this, (if Jefferson and Madison knew the meaning of the phrase,) is inconsistent with Slavery. It prohibits the States from passing any bills of attainder, or laws impairing the obligation of contracts. It provides that no person shall be deprived of liberty without due process of law. It professes to "establish justice, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity." All this, one would think, was "sufficiently conclusive" of its Anti-Slavery character.

Mr. McDuffie and Mr. Wendell Phillips, however, are not satisfied. Here are two or three clauses that are claimed to be capable of a contrary construction. To this I reply, that the rule of legal construction requires that the document be construed in favour of liberty and justice, if it is capable of such a construction. Instead of admitting this, Mr. Phillips does the opposite. He admits that the *words* of the Preamble, "*properly*" used, would make the Constitution inconsistent with Slavery. *This* use of the word, however, he will not adopt, and therefore pronounces the Constitution to be pro-slavery! Mr. McDuffie does the same, declaring Slavery to be the "corner-stone of our republican institutions."

Thus the decision, in the minds of many, is held in suspense. What argument shall I adduce next? I find, on reflection, that the idea so deeply imbedded in many minds, of the constitutional guaranties of Slavery, is derived, *not* from the language of the instrument, *not* from its avowed object and prevailing spirit, but simply from an *assumption* of the very point in debate, viz: that Slavery, from the beginning, has been an essential element in our institutions! *That* assumption rests upon another, viz: the *legality* of Slavery. I inquire when and *how* it became legalized? No one contends that the previous "Articles of Confederation" contained the slightest guaranty or recognition of it. In the process of framing it, the word "white" was stricken out, to *prevent* the plan of any such recognition. The Declaration of Independence certainly did not legalize it, nor recognize its legality. It is admitted that if the Declaration of Independence be of binding legal force, as a part of our constitutional law, (as I claim it to be,) there can be no constitutional Slavery. I must, then, look beyond the date of the Declaration of Independence to find the origin of legal Slavery. But where shall I find it? In the Colonial legislation? Whence did that legislation derive its authority? From the Colonial Charters. But could there be legislation under those Charters that could legalize Slavery? No, for it was specially provided *in* those Charters, that no laws should be enacted *contrary* to the Common Law of England. That *same* Common Law that Mr. Phillips admits to be the death warrant of Slavery, wherever it operates! That same Common Law, in obedience to which, the Court of King's Bench, in 1772, decided that Slavery *was* not, and never *had* been, and never *could* be, legal in England. That same Common Law that affirms, (as I affirm,) that *Slavery never can be made legal.* Here, at length, tracing back the chain of my argument, you arrive at the link which you call my "fundamental principle."

Not so "fundamental," however, that it cannot be spared. Suppose Slavery *could* be made legal. We have the fact, established by judicial decision in 1772, that it *was not*, and had never been, legal in England. That fact covers the question. Slavery under colonial legislation was *not* legal, and the Declaration of Independence, and the Articles of Confederation, did not legalize it. Consequently there was no legal Slavery in 1789 *to be* constitutionally guaranteed or recognized. And hence the forced construction by which such guaranty or recognition is attempted to be made out, must be rejected. The legal rules of interpretation will not permit (in a litigated case) that the language should be construed to guaranty Slavery, *where it did not legally exist.*

The result will be the same, even if we dismiss the decision of 1772. The declaration of "inalienable rights," &c. abolished Slavery, (if it *had* any previous legal existence,) in all the States that made that declaration, as it did in Massachusetts, according to the decision of the Courts in that State.

I can afford to spare you even more than this. Blot out the Declaration of Independence, if you please. If *that* possesses no legal power, we are not absolved from our allegiance to the British Crown, we are under British law, Common law, decision of 1772, the recent act of emancipation, and all.

Or, waiving this last argument, and placing ourselves under the Constitution of 1789, *without* any Declaration of Independence, if you choose to deny its existence; the express provisions of that Federal Constitution—its guaranties of "a republican government," &c. &c. cover the whole ground. Mr. Phillips and Mr. McDuffie may demur. But the *people* will settle the question rather than construe away their *own* liberties, as those gentlemen do. If you think I lack faith in my own arguments, because I give you too many for your convenience, I must contrive to do as well as I can, *without* your confidence in my sincerity.

WILLIAM GOODELL.

P. S. An error occurs, in the printing (or writing) of my last letter, as your readers will probably understand. "Mr. Phillips thinks it a sufficient evidence of the un-soundness (not soundness) of my constitutional doctrines," &c. (second column, 39th line from top.)

W. G.

* Both these expressions, ("*rightfully*" and "*human laws,*") which the version of the Standard attributes to Mr. Brougham, he seems to have been very careful to avoid.

G. F. WHITE AND ROSE-STREET MEETING.

In the early history of the Society of Friends, it appears there were a few instances of conspicuous individuals, whose conduct brought reproach upon it. These cases were eagerly seized upon by their enemies, and "pulpit, press, and talk," were put in requisition to excite public odium against them. The Society justly complained of this conduct, as cruel and unjust. It proceeded from a bitter, persecuting spirit then, and the like conduct proceeds from the same unholy spirit now. But it is even worse now than it was then, as the age is much more refined. Friends bore their testimony against the evils complained of, but still their persecutors never ceased to use them as opportunity offered, to gratify their envy and malice by charging them upon the Society.

But a wonderful change has come over the Society in this city since those days—they now tolerate in their own members, that which they then so justly condemned in others. These reflections have been elicited by what follows.

G. F. White has for several years been labouring to bring Peace societies, Temperance societies, Abolition societies, and all other societies, having for their object the melioration of the condition of the human family, into contempt. And to accomplish this purpose, he has frequently made statements utterly untrue; and he uses language, and applies epithets to them, the most vile and sarcastic. On the third of last month, in Rose-street meeting, he assailed the Temperance Society, and mentioned that a prominent Temperance lecturer, when in this city some time ago, had been received with great cordiality—the people opened their houses to welcome him, and his lectures were numerously attended. But since then, he had killed a man in a duel, and after the man was dead, he requested that he might be held up, that he might shoot him again.

The truth of this story is doubted, but whether true or false, he turned it upon the Temperance Society, and endeavoured to fasten upon them the odium of an act, over which, if true, they had no control. The odium could attach only to the perpetrator, and besides, the act has no connection with temperance. The Temperance Society condemn such conduct as sincerely as G. F. W. But why should he complain? He "would call no man a sinner." He says a man may join the banditti, he may sail under the pirate's flag, he may steep his feet in the blood of the slain, and not sin against God. If he may do all this and not sin, surely he might kill a man in a duel, and not be more guilty. But enough of such folly, not to say wickedness.

Suppose some individual was to rise in a large temperance meeting, and expose the misdoings of some conspicuous individual in the Society of Friends, (and the conduct of G. F. W. is well calculated to provoke such an event,) what would he think?—What would any man of common sense and common honesty think? They would condemn it as unchristian, as they now do the conduct of G. F. W.

A Friend from New Jersey came to the city a few weeks ago—he is liberal in his sentiments, and an ardent advocate of the abolition of Slavery—he came under a religious concern, but George took care to occupy the time that the meeting is usually held, that the stranger might not have an opportunity to relieve his mind.

In the 5th month, 1845, not long after the Prison Association had got under way, G. F. W. with his usual vehemence, when speaking of the agents of the benevolent societies existing among us who receive a compensation for their services—designated them as traders in benevolence, and said, "they were the scum and offscouring of the earth—more degraded than the devils in hell!" He did not say whether he included in these denunciations those agents who are employed and paid by the Yearly Meeting for services in some of their benevolent enterprises.

The course of this man for the last six or seven years, has been a libel on the Christian religion, an insult to common sense, and a lasting reproach to the society that tolerates such abominations.

Some Friends may, perhaps, censure me for making these exposures. But why should they? They are already of public notoriety, and are sanctioned by the meeting to which he belongs, but not by the Society in general. If any are dissatisfied, they may recur to the time when they freely paid their money to support publications that exposed the proceedings of the Orthodox, which never equalled in absurdity, what is often witnessed in Rose street meeting.

ISAAC TATEM HOPPER.

3d mo. 1847.

LETTER FROM THE REV. MR. PAGE.

To the Editor of the National Anti-Slavery Standard:

DEAR SIR:—I have just received your paper of this week, fresh, and direct from your office, for which I sincerely thank you. Although you have noticed me once and again through the Standard, in a manner I like not, yet you have been manly, in every instance, by sending me forthwith the number which contained the notice. And then I am much gratified with the open doors you keep for the replies of those whom you assail in your publication. It shows a magnanimity which I admire. I wish as much might be said of another paper in this city, which lately flung at myself and others its "testimony against caste," and which then shut out explanation. I also agree with you, Sir, in many more of your views than perhaps you imagine. Indeed I am confident, from the articles you have published, that you have mistaken your man, and "waked up the wrong passenger."

To use your own figure—if I "*hang* myself with the rope" you give me, as you seem to anticipate, I will agree that the "fault" shall not be *yours*, nor will I ask for "commiseration" from any source but such as should be given to the "*ungodly*." The act shall be all my own, and it shall be wanton suicide, without benefit of clergy or editors. Your hands shall be free from my blood. Still, believing not in capital punishment, as I suppose is the fact with you, I pray that you do not rejoice over my execution before I swing, nor meddle with my ashes after I am buried. But enough of this.

I agree with you perfectly, Sir, in the sentiment, that those "negro pews" in our sanctuaries, which grow out of prejudice against colour, and in which, to use your own language, (July 30, 1846,) "God's children are set apart as a marked and hated race"—such pews, Sir, I unite with you in proclaiming as exceedingly "unchristian;" and the minister of the Gospel who "defends" them, or becomes their "champion," as you represent I have done, certainly is on the high way to his own destruction with the virtuous and humane. When you publish him *truly* to the world, at the call of Providence, you do him no injustice. His coming and attendant woes are deserved. We should pity him in the miseries his crimes occasion, but say amen to the punishment which the hand of God inflicts, and which universal good demands. But *if* you publish him as a "champion and defender" of such enormities—if you proclaim him as "*almost impious*" in his pro-slaveryism, and prejudice against colour—a "reverend trifler" with the most sacred interest—an almost pulpit "blasphemer," at the expense of the poor and oppressed—if you do this, when, in fact, he is altogether innocent of such sins, then, I affirm, you do him the greatest injustice. Indeed I can conceive of no charge so serious as that of being *pro-slavery*. I would sooner be accused of stealing, lying, murder, treason—a violation of all God's commands. For the man who is, *in truth, pro* (*for*) Slavery, in sentiment and soul, commits the whole. He is prince and patroon of all these pools of abomination. If we are the men, then "hang" us in your regards, soon as you please. But I pray you, ring not these charges so often, and so out of place, that even the guilty among us, in these respects, shall live commended in the esteem of millions by having so many of the excellent of the earth thrown into association with them.

The question now arises, am I thus depraved?—Have I this despicable prejudice against colour?—Did I, in my article of last summer—an extract from which has been published so extensively on the house-tops of two continents—become a "champion and defender" of the "Jim-Crow pew?" Have I, in reality, thus far, said aught in favour of treating a portion of God's poor, humble, lowly children with obloquy and contempt—setting them apart by themselves as a "marked and hated race?" Such is the very language of your charge. So have I been reported, far and near. I have endured it long in silence, but I now, whether "officious" or not—whether "*hung*" or not—publicly and indignantly repel the charge, in toto. From beginning to end, I proclaim it an outrageous calumny, *or* an entire mistake. It becomes me not to judge harshly of the *motives* of others. I therefore will suppose, that what they have written on this subject arose from misconception, and not from a design to injure. So may it appear on the last great day. I also call on all those papers, at home and abroad, which have contributed to the circulation of the charge, (the Liberator, the Albany Patriot, the Philadelphia Freeman, the Universe, the London Patriot, &c.) likewise to publish this, my denial of the charge, together with my following statement of facts. This I do reluctantly; for I want no such conspicuity in the public eye as this will occasion. But important interests, I think, are suffering for the want of what I now intend to say.

You are aware, I presume, that a true extract can be given from an author's writings, in such a way as to utterly misrepresent his meaning. His expressions may have been called forth by something written before, by another individual, which constitutes its context, and in the light of which, it should be interpreted. Or, it may be surrounded with comments that, in the absence of the article itself, you will be made to regard it with the greatest displeasure. As *thus* presented to your view, it becomes an utter perversion of his meaning. Now *precisely* in this way, was the extract from my article against which so much exception has been taken, connected with a previous one, from the editor of the Standard, which constituted its context, and in the light of which it should have been understood. And then, I think—through misapprehension, perhaps, it was commented upon, most unfairly. Only see.

The original article in the Standard, which occasioned my communication, among other things, as the editor afterwards explains himself, "charged, that in Dr. Patton's church, a portion of God's people, are treated with obloquy and contempt, and set apart by themselves as a marked and hated race." Such, Sir, is the very language of your paper, July 30th, 1846. And this obloquy and contempt, we were told, consisted not merely in the fact that the Spring-street church had within it what you termed the "Jim-Crow pew," but also in another fact, viz: that even this pew was obscure, in the "distance," contemptible. Such were your charges, as I sincerely understood them.

Now in replying to all this, I in the first place, frankly admitted that there were separate seats in that house of worship for the coloured people, as might also have been admitted respecting the great mass of American churches, of almost every denomination. The Spring street church is by no means an exception to the general rule; nor should it be made the object of such *especial* censure. Nearly *all* are in the same condemnation. But then, after admitting thus much, I denied the charge that these pews for the coloured people were so mean, obscure, in the "distance"—such things of "obloquy and contempt," as was represented. I said, indeed, that the pews were there; but I said not one word in defence, or apology of that wicked prejudice against colour so prevalent in this country, which occasioned them. Nor will I now. I am no advocate of these pews, whatever may be public prejudice. I always sit in them myself, when circumstances seem to require it. I do not, indeed, make a *show* of my sentiments on this subject, as did the English missionary, of whom you speak. But I always do the thing, when it can be done without striving after the eccentricity. I never turn God's finger aside, or refuse to obey its intimations, when it points me to the side of a coloured man, believe me or not, as you please. Know, then, that in my article so misrepresented, I intended merely to affirm, that the separate seats in the Spring-street church for the coloured people, were by no means so despicable as I understood you to insinuate; and well might I have made the affirmation—for just the opposite of your "charge," in this respect, was true. The coloured people of the Spring street church were not "*set apart*" in their pews at all, by the Spring street congregation, much less were they "set apart *as a marked and hated race.*" Those pews were selected by the coloured people *themselves*—they were the pews of their own choice. Others were offered them, but they preferred the ones they had selected, and were indulged in their preferences. It is true they were apart by themselves; but it is not true that they were "*set apart*" by Dr. Patton's people. Their separation may have arisen in a measure, from the fact that men of the same complexion, as well as birds of the same feather, will, of their own accord, flock together, without any intention of "marking and hating" others of a different peculiarity. Or this separation may have arisen from a consciousness in the minds of the coloured people, that the prejudices and usages of society here, in this country, required it at their hands. They may have selected their pews in consequence of public prejudice and usage; as a matter of modesty and Christian lowliness; and the Spring-street church, may have acquiesced in their choice, in view of the surrounding usages, almost universal, which I have not "defended," and of which I, thus far, have been no champion. However this may be, the coloured people selected their own seats, and were not set apart by

the Spring-street people. A knowledge of public usage existing in the minds of the coloured people, may have done it; but no expressed wish on the part of that congregation was given on the subject These pews so selected by the coloured people, were not obscure, incommodious, nor in the distance, as your article intimates. They were conspicuous, large, airy in the summer, warm in the winter; near Dr. Patton, where the preaching could be heard most distinctly. All this I affirmed, in reply to your charge about "obloquy and contempt—a marked and hated race." And then by way of climax to my assertions, I said that in some respects, these coloured people had a position in their sanctuary on earth, not so distant and contemptuous, worthy of being burlesqued with the name of "Jim-Crow pew;" but like that which Christ occupies in the infinitely grander sanctuary above. I thus compared the *position* simply, in the one temple, with the *position* in the other. In some respects, I saw a *resemblance* between them, but not an *equality*. And who cannot. It was just in that place I asked the question, which, without the context of your previous article, excited so much indignation over the Atlantic. But I asked it not, as you supposed, by way of trifling with my coloured brother, nor to pour contempt on him, but in indignant rebuke of the phrase "Jim-Crow pew," with its attendant epithets of scorn which you applied so freely to the position of the coloured man in the Spring-street place of worship. Who, I intended to ask by that question, who will not shrink from giving such a name to a similar position in the sanctuary above, occupied by Christ; and my argument, as avery one who reads it with care will perceive, was this: like things in different places may be called by like names. But do you shudder to call the position of Christ in the temple above, by a name, the mere quotation of which, from your own lips, makes the one who quotes it seem like a blaspheming trifler; then do not give to a position somewhat similar in the sanctuary on earth, a similar name of sarcasm and contempt.

And yet my language has been so given to the public, by yourself and others, as to prove upon me, if possible, in the convictions of two hemispheres—the sin of blasphemy against God—together with the almost kindred one of being pro-slavery, the poor coloured man's despiser; for whom the Saviour feels so deeply, and whom I would no sooner offend than I would throw myself into the sea, with a millstone fastened to my neck. Once and again have I sat with him, side by side, on the same seat, in God's earthly courts, and felt ennobled by the position.

Now, perhaps, there was a want of good taste about my expression—perhaps there was an offensive boldness in the comparison, from which the sensitive mind will recoil; or, perhaps, there was an obscurity of thought in my mode of stating the argument. But it remains for me yet to perceive that there was any blasphemy, or levity, or "reverend, pro-slavery contempt" of the coloured man, either in my utterance or idea. Least of all, can I discover how *my* individual sins, if sins they were, should be visited upon Dr. Patton, or the American delegation, who never endorsed them.

They surely were not made at the coloured man's expense. The phrase, "Jim-Crow pew," was not original with me, nor has it my approval when applied to anything I have seen in the Spring-street church. Neither did my comparison between the position of the coloured people in their sanctuary on earth, and the position of Christ, in his sanctuary above, pour contempt on *them*. If it took from any one, it was from Christ, and what it took from the greater was given to the less. Nor do I think, after all the ado of the papers on this subject, that there was any real approximation toward even the irreverent, in this comparing mere *things* on earth with mere *things* in heaven. Be ye perfect, says the Bible, even as your Father, which is in heaven, is perfect. What a thought! man perfect as his Maker. In this passage, *beings* are compared together—I contrasted only *things*. I spoke of *pews*. The Bible, as quoted above, speaks of God, and man, and moral character. Does it blaspheme? Is it irreverent?

Now, then, for your questions: "Did the reverend gentleman mean to say there is a Jim-Crow pew in Heaven, or did he only mean that the high seat in Dr. Patton's church would have been good enough for the Son of God, with his dark Jewish complexion?" I meant neither—nothing but mistake, and mockery, or monomania, would propose the questions. I only meant that the separate pews which the coloured people in the Spring-street church, have selected for themselves, are not such things "of obloquy and contempt," as you represent. They are not so obscure, incommodious, and in the distance. They rather, in some respects, although in an infinitely inferior degree, resemble the position of Christ, in the upper temple; and deserve not the name and the description which you have given them. And yet I have not "defended" these separations, nor the public usages, or prejudices which occasioned them. I only give to the devil, if devil you will have him—his due. If that be blasphemy, make the best of it.

My next shall be briefer.

Yours, sincerely,

WILLIAM PAGE.

Professor McClintock, of Dickinson College, Carlisle, Pa. writes as follows, to the Christian Advocate & Journal. We can afford to admire him for his nobleness in telling truths so disagreeable to the people, notwithstanding he acts only on the principle of giving the devil his due. There are very few Doctors of Divinity who will do that—at least in *this* world:

Now how has this change been brought to pass? Let the confession come, Messrs. Editors; *the Abolitionists have done it*. Political events have done their share; but *politicians would have remained as they were, but for the stimulus which public opinion received from the Abolitionists*. Wrong they doubtless have been in many respects,—headstrong, fanatical, abusive, Pharisaical, if you please,—but *they have done this thing*. They have stirred up men's minds to contemplate a great truth, no matter what evil passions they may have stirred up besides. Perhaps even the ultraism was necessary to give the impulse, the energy, the almost reckless daring, and the unflagging perseverance, that were essential to so great an enterprise. The evils of the ultraism were many; but they have passed, or are rapidly passing away; the enthusiasm and the perseverance remain, and may they remain until the work is done.

The confession is not quite complete. It was formerly often said, and is now sometimes, that the Anti-Slavery agitation only tightened the bonds of the slave, diminished his privileges, and multiplied his grievances. Southern men, not seeing that they were proclaiming their own shame, said this so often, that they believed it themselves, and induced many at the North to believe it too. I confess that I was among the number, having both spoken and written to this effect, in youthful ignorance; but I have since learned, (and could prove, if it were necessary,) that *the condition of the slaves, taking the whole South together, has been vastly improved during this agitation*. The tree of truth has sent forth its mighty branches, "its stirring and far-heard music, while waving in the storm" of this, as of all other great controversies. *The slaveholders have learned that the eyes of the world are on them, and have walked accordingly*. No less a man than WILLIAM CAPERS unwillingly testifies to this, in the Southern Christian Advocate of Feb. 5, 1847. Writing about the slave missions, (and forgetting, at the time, his anti-slavery friends at the North,) he says: "Only think, that, where seventeen years ago, the coloured people had been time out of mind without the Gospel—(no preaching, no sacraments, no Bible instruction, no catechism, no Christian teaching, or training whatever; as for instance, in the great rice-field swamps of Waccamaw, Santee, Pon Pon, and Combahee)—there, at the present time, they are more fully served than elsewhere in the country," &c. Be it remembered that seventeen years is but a little over the period of the anti-slavery agitation. Dr. Capers might deny the inference; but he has only furnished one case out of many that might be adduced to sustain the point which I have made.

I never could be an Abolitionist proper; for I never could believe, (and never shall so long as facts that now exist remain,) that *all* slaveholders are sinners, and should be cut off from the fellowship of Christianity: yet I wish, with your permission, to record the foregoing statements in your columns. Many of the Abolitionists have done badly; and the Garrison sect seem now to be actuated by the spirit of the devil rather than of Christ; but this is no reason why they should not have their due.

The Anti-Slavery Standard.

NEW-YORK, THURSDAY, APRIL 15, 1847.

American Anti-Slavery Society.

THIRTEENTH ANNIVERSARY.

THE THIRTEENTH ANNUAL MEETING OF THE AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY will be held in the TABERNACLE, BROADWAY, N. Y. on TUESDAY, the 11th day of MAY. The increasing interest in the Anti-Slavery cause promises an unusually large and important meeting.—The bold encroachments of the slave power upon the rights of the North, and the active measures of the slaveholders to extend and perpetuate the curse of human bondage, are awakening the people to a sense of their position both as oppressors and oppressed. All the activity and zeal of the friends of the slave are needed to arouse the country to the conviction that the only safety of the whole PEOPLE is in adopting the principle of the American Anti-Slavery Society, of

NO UNION WITH SLAVEHOLDERS!

The business meetings, which will continue in session from Tuesday noon to Thursday evening, will be held in the APOLLO SALOON, 410, Broadway.

WM. LLOYD GARRISON, President.

WENDELL PHILLIPS, } Secretaries.
S. H. GAY, }

Lysander Spooner on the Constitution.

"DOMESTIC SLAVERY IS THE MOST PROMINENT FEATURE IN THE ARISTOCRATIC COUNTENANCE OF THE PROPOSED CONSTITUTION."—Gouverneur Morris.

Having finished the consideration of Mr. Spooner's first two points,—namely, that the people never intended to sanction Slavery,—and that even if they did, the Constitution, *legally interpreted*, does not sanction it,—we pass to his third and last argument:

That there was no constitutional or legal Slavery existing in the States in 1789, to which the pro-slavery clauses, if there really are any, in the United States Constitution, could apply, or can now apply.

In attempting to sustain this position, he argues as follows:

1st. The Colonial Charters did not authorize the establishment of Slavery here.

2d. The English Statutes never recognized it.

3d. If it were tolerated here, the decision of Lord Mansfield, in the Somersett case, 1772, put an end to its legal existence.

4th. The Colonial Statutes establishing it were void, because they did not sufficiently define the persons who were to be slaves.

5th. The Declaration of Independence abolished it.

6th. The Articles of Confederation do not refer to it; and the State Constitutions of 1789 are either inconsistent with the existence of any such institution, or wholly silent about it.

We shall notice each of these points in order, and as briefly as possible.

1st. "The Colonial Charters did not authorize the establishment of Slavery here."

Mr. Spooner says (p. 21.):

The general provisions of those charters, as will be seen from the extracts given in the note, were, that the laws of the colonies should not be repugnant or contrary, but, as nearly as circumstances would allow, conformable to the laws, statutes, and rights of our kingdom of England.

Slavery, he thinks, utterly inconsistent with the common law, which was adopted throughout the colonies. To this point he cites the following language of the Supreme Court, who, quoting the New Hampshire Charter, remark upon it thus:

The charter of New Hampshire provided, "So always that the form of proceeding in such cases, and the judgment thereupon to be given, be as consonant and agreeable to the laws and statutes of this our realm of England, as the present state and condition of our subjects inhabiting within the limits aforesaid, (*i. e.* of the province,) and the circumstances of the place will admit." Independent, however, of such a provision, we take it to be a clear principle that the common law, in force at the emigration of our ancestors, is deemed the birthright of the colonies, unless so far as it is inapplicable to their situation, or repugnant to their other rights and privileges. *A fortiori* the principle applies to a royal province.—(9 Cranch's United States' Reports, 332–3.)

In reply to this, nothing more is necessary, than to point the reader to the qualifications contained in the above extracts. The laws are to be conformable to English law, "*as nearly as circumstances allow*," "*as the present state and condition of our subjects, and the circumstances of the place will admit.*" The common law is adopted, "unless so far as it is *inapplicable to their situation*," &c. Now these exceptions are broad enough "to drive a coach and six through," as was said of a famous English statute: or as we once heard Elihu Burritt assert, "If you make a breach in the golden rule, no matter how small it be, Hell and all its legions can pass through."

The Colonial Assemblies and the King were to judge how far, and when "circumstances," and "their state and condition," &c. &c. rendered it necessary to depart from their English model. The only question is one of fact and history; how far *did* they find it necessary to do so, and what laws did they enact in consequence? If we open the Statutes enacted by these colonies under their Charters, and approved by the Kings, who granted the Charters, we shall find they all legalized the Slave-Trade and Slavery. It is too late now to say that such acts were not warranted by their Charters. *They* were the judges whether, and how far, it was necessary to vary from English law, and they have declared, by their acts, that they judged it necessary. Their decision, when approved by the King, is final. There is no appeal. As Mr. Spooner does not deny that the Colonies *tried* to make slave laws, and as such *attempts* are conclusive proof that they thought such laws "allowed by their state, condition, and circumstances," and that the common law on this subject was "inapplicable,"—and further, as they are allowed by the Charters to be the *only* and final judges of the matter, we consider this point settled—and the consistency of slave laws with the Charters made out.

2d. The English Statutes never recognized Slavery here.—(pp. 24, 25.)

Mr. Spooner must be a Tory in disguise, or a tyro in law, to imagine that it was necessary they should do so in order to render the system legal. Has he read our history so superficially—has he omitted that somewhat important (!) page of it, the Revolutionary discussions of 1775, so entirely, as not to know that, who should vote here, how property should be divided and held, who should marry and how;—in a word, all individual rights and relations, and all matters of property, were settled by *Colonial* laws and customs;—and that this we claimed as our dearest birthright? Aye, and fought for it seven years? No matter, as to this question of domestic slavery, what *English* laws said, the question is, what did American law say? Every child knows this.

Mr. Spooner says, that parliamentary "toleration of the Slave-*Trade* could not make Slavery—*the right of properly in man*—lawful anywhere, not even on board the slave ship."—(p. 23.)

This is strange, we might almost add, foolish doctrine. All laws must have a reasonable interpretation. The right "to declare war," given to Congress, means, of course, not only *to say* that war exists, but to *carry it on*, otherwise Congress does not possess that power. So "to raise and support armies," means not merely to *keep* these expensive baubles, but to use them.—(Story Comm. 1. 412.) Mr. Spooner tells us, (p. 66,) that the right "to keep and bear arms," secured by the Constitution to the people, "implies the right to use them, as much as a provision to buy and keep food, would imply the right to eat it." Plainly, then, when Parliament allow men to *trade* in slaves, thereby affirming it to be legally right to do so, they impliedly allow them to hold and own that which they are permitted to buy and sell. This is too plain to need argument.

Mr. Spooner says, speaking of *Slavery* itself:

"It is also doubtful whether Parliament had the power—or perhaps rather it is certain that they had not the power—to legalize it anywhere, if they had attempted to do so.

"Have Parliament the constitutional prerogative of abolishing the writ of *habeas corpus*? the trial by jury? or the freedom of speech and the press? If not, have they the prerogative of abolishing a man's right of property in his own person?"—p. 24.

To these questions we answer unhesitatingly, yes. The Constitution of the English Government supposes Parliament to possess these powers. It is a self-evident proposition, that the power which enacts a law can repeal it. Now Parliament establishes *habeas corpus*; of course they can repeal it. "Parliament might, if public opinion would allow them, abolish the *habeas corpus* act forever." This is the language of Lieber, speaking of the omnipotence of Parliament.—(Pol. Her. p. 187.) Parliament does abolish the right of jury trial every year, as to every Englishman in a naval or military situation. They might do it as to slaves, equally as well. That they might regulate Slavery was very clearly the opinion of Mansfield, in the Somersett case. We need not dwell on this. In this country the case is different. In most, if not all of the States, the Constitution protects the writ of habeas corpus even against the Legislature; clearly showing, that without such a provision it was thought our Legislatures might, like the English, do with that as with all other laws, alter and repeal them at their pleasure. Any one who wishes to learn how "absolutely despotic," how "sovereign and uncontrollable to repeal all laws, civil, military, ecclesiastical, &c. &c.; to alter the established religion, to *change the constitution* of the kingdom and of Parliaments themselves;" "in short, to do everything not *naturally impossible*"—Parliament is, may consult Blackstone, 1. 160. 161. Also 2. Dall. Rep. 308. De Lolme, p. 134.

To show that this despotic power did undertake to act, and to establish *slave property* in the colonies, we shall trouble the reader by citing a single Statute, pointed out to us by William J. Bowditch, Esq. though Mr. Spooner was not able to find any. Did time permit, doubtless we might fill our pages with more. The quotation given below is an express command by Parliament to seize and sell negro slaves, like any other property, when needed to pay the debts of the master; being the clearest and most distinct recognition, it will be seen, of *slave property*. The language here is unambiguous, and serves to explain the wording of other Statutes, about which Mr. Spooner has quibbled, trying to make out that they did not refer to *slaves*, because they merely spoke of *negroes*, (see his page 26.) "Negro" is the usual term in many old laws for slave, and the two words are used interchangeably. The Virginia Constitution of 1776, charges George III. with "prompting *our negroes* to rise in arms against us, those very negroes, whom, by an inhuman use of his negative he hath refused us permission to exclude." See also Conn. Act, 1784.

5 George II. c. 7. 6. Statutes at Large, 74.

"An act for the more easy recovery of debts in his Majesty's Plantations and Colonies in America.

4. And be it further enacted, by the authority aforesaid, that from and after the said twenty-ninth day of September, 1732, the *houses, lands, negroes, and other hereditaments*, and *real* estates, situate or being within any of the said Plantations belonging to any person indebted, shall be *liable to* and *chargeable with* all just *debts*, duties, and demands, of what nature or kind soever, owing by any such person to his Majesty or any of his subjects, and shall and may be assets for the satisfaction thereof, in like manner as real estates are by the law of England liable to the satisfaction of debts due by bond or other specialty, and shall be subject to the like remedies, proceedings, and process, in every court of law or equity in any of the said Plantations respectively, for seizing, extending, *selling*, or *disposing of* any such *houses, lands, negroes*, and other hereditaments and real estate towards the satisfaction of such *debts*, duties, and demands, in like manner as personal estates in any of the said Plantations respectively are seized, extended, sold or disposed of for the satisfaction of debts."

See also 23 George II. c. 31, A. D. 1750.

An act for extending and improving the trade to Africa.

"Whereas the trade to and from Africa is very advantageous to Great Britain, and necessary for the supplying the Plantations and Colonies thereunto belonging with *a sufficient number of negroes at reasonable rates*," &c. &c.

Further on the Act speaks—though Mr. Spooner, who quotes liberally from it, never got so far as to see it—of "NEGROES OR OTHER GOODS!" Yet Mr. Spooner thinks there is nothing in this Statute to show that "negroes" means slaves, or that they are considered property!

3d. If Slavery was tolerated here, the decision of Lord Mansfield, in the Somersett case, 1772, put an end to its legal existence.

James Somersett was the slave of Charles Stewart, *of Virginia*, by whom he was carried thence to London, in 1769. Sometime after he quitted Mr. Stewart; who thereupon had him seized and placed on board ship to be carried to Jamaica. Granville Sharpe caused him to be brought before Lord Mansfield, on a writ of *habeas corpus*, to try the question, "whether a slave, by coming into England, became free?" Lord Mansfield, in 1772, decided that no slaveholder could exercise any authority over his slave while in England, or could carry a slave out of England without his consent. [The English Courts have since held, that if a slave chooses to leave England and return to a slave country, he resumes the condition of a slave.]

So far as the case of Somersett has any reference to the Colonies, it *recognizes the legal existence of Slavery in Virginia*. For the arguments of Counsel and the decision of Mansfield, all proceed on the supposition, that *at home*, in Virginia, Somersett *was a slave*. The decision was, that a person held as a slave abroad, if once landed in England, could not be taken thence against his will. Now if Somersett was not a *slave* in Virginia, the whole case proceeded on a mistake. *As far as this case goes*, therefore, it recognizes the legal existence of Slavery in Virginia.

The case of Somersett was adopted in the Colonies to the exact extent to which it went. Those Colonies which abolished Slavery, (Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New Hampshire, &c.) either refused, under its authority, to deliver up slaves brought or flying into their limits, or specially provided on what conditions masters should be allowed to bring their slaves with them.

The Somersett case has never been supposed to have any further reference to the Colonies than that above specified. Instead of deciding Slavery to be illegal here, it made no decision respecting American Slavery either way. But if it is to be quoted at all, the only thing found in it is a tacit recognition of the legal existence of Slavery in Virginia.

4th. The Colonial Statutes establishing, or relating to Slavery, are void, because they do not define, with sufficient precision, who are to be slaves.

In most of the English colonies in America, Slavery originated in custom. Such has usually been its origin wherever it has existed. Some of the Colonies afterwards regulated, recognized, and established it by particular statutes; some left it to that irregular custom in which it commenced. In this respect, *black* Slavery, on this side the water, exactly resembled *white* Slavery (villeinage) in the mother-country. Both originated in custom, and the rules regulating each were, from time to time, laid down by Courts, or by the Legislatures, as it chanced.

If to this any one shall object, that "all customs must have a reasonable beginning," and that *malus usus abolendus est*, (a bad custom is to be disregarded,) we shall reply:

1st. Why did not these maxims of the Common Law, if they are to be taken literally, abolish villeinage (white Slavery) in England? Any explanation which makes them consistent with that system of Slavery, will show that they were consistent with our Slavery also.

2d. We reply, with Lord Coke, that "*reasonable* is not to be understood of every unlearned man's reason, but of *legal* and *artificial* reason, warranted by authority of law;" and with Sir William Scott, (Lord Stowell,) "when it is cried out that 'bad customs are to be disregarded,' it is *first* to be *proved*, that, even in the consideration of England, the custom of Slavery is considered a *bad custom* in the Colonies."

But Mr. Spooner goes further, and asserts that Slavery cannot legally originate in custom. It must be authorized, he says, from the very first by express statute. He founds this opinion on the language of Mansfield; which is the *only* evidence he quotes in support of such a novel and strange idea. See the remarks in our last, of Lord Stowell's, as to Slavery in Antigua, 2. Hagg. 94. In the Somersett case, Mansfield said:

"So high an act of dominion must be recognized by the law of the country where it is used. * * * The state of Slavery is of such a nature, that it is incapable of being introduced on any reasons, moral or political—but only positive law, which preserves its force long after the reasons, occasion, and time itself from whence it was created, is erased from the memory. It is so odious that nothing can be suffered to support it but positive law."

From this Mr. Spooner infers, as follows:

"Slavery, then, being the creature of positive legislation alone, can be created only by legislation that shall so particularly describe the persons to be made slaves, that they may be distinguished from all others. If there be any doubt left by the *letter* of the law, as to the persons to be made slaves, the efficacy of all other slave legislation is defeated simply by that uncertainty. * * * Custom imparts to Slavery no legal sanction."—(p. 32, and see p. 24.)

We confess we do not see anything of this in the remarks of Lord Mansfield. He says merely that Slavery must be created by *positive law*, but not a word as to the exactness with which the persons must be pointed out and distinguished. All this is Mr. Spooner's addition.

Again; what is meant by *positive law*? Does it refer exclusively to *statutes*, written *acts* of Legislatures, or may it include usages, customs, and rules of Courts also?

We answer, it includes all these; the epithet is as often applied to these as to written statutes. This indeed is evident from the very language of Mansfield; "positive law, which preserves its force *long after the reasons, occasion, and time itself, from whence it was created, is erased from the memory.*"

Now the *time*, date, of a written statute endures as long as the statute itself, and so often of the rest. Lord Mansfield is evidently describing a usage or custom, which insensibly grows up in a country, unmarked and unregarded, until by and by, it is impossible to tell precisely where, when, and how it commenced.

Chief Justice Shaw, in the Med case, says of this remark of Lord Mansfield:

"By *positive law*, in this connection, may be as well understood *customary law* as the enactment of a statute; the word is used to designate *rules established by tacit acquiescence*, or by the legislative act of any State, and which derive their force from such acquiescence or enactments, and not because they are the dictates of natural justice, and as such of universal obligation."

We have quoted the above remark of Judge Shaw, not only as reliable authority for our assertion, but also as containing a concise definition of "positive law." Authority on this point we do not need, for every reader of law books knows the meaning; and the only wonder is how so ingenious a man as Mr. Spooner ever fell into the gross error of founding an essential portion of his argument on so plain a mistake. *Positive* law is the term usually employed to distinguish the rules, usages, and laws which are made *by man*, from those which God has implanted in our nature. It matters not whether these rules and laws are written or unwritten, whether they originate in custom or are expressly enacted by Legislatures. In a word, *positive* means *arbitary*, and is used as opposed to *moral*.

Our limits will not permit quotations to show the use of this word, neither are they necessary, but any one who is curious on the point, may find the word used in this sense everywhere in law books, and especially, Blackstone 1. p. 70, 62; Chritian's Note to Blackstone, p. 58, and Doctor and Student quoted there; Selden on Fortescue, quoted at the end of Mr. Spooner's first chapter; Taylor's Civil Law, p. 132; Wooddesson, p. 46, &c. &c; Stephen's Blackstone, vol. 1, p. 57, 30, 47, &c.; Bouvier and Tomline's Law Dictionaries; Austin's Jurisprudence; Rutherforth, W2eaton, passim, &c. &c.

Such being the meaning of the word *positive*, Mr. Spooner's argument falls to the ground; and we are authorized, in asserting that custom and usage are not only a usual, but a *legal* commencement of Slavery; and that there is nothing in the language of Mansfield opposed to this idea.

Nevertheless, the Colonies *did* take care to point out and define by statute, very precisely who were to be slaves. We need not spread out the laws here. They will be found in Stroud, and a part of them in the notes to Mr. Spooner's fourth chapter. They enact:

1st. That all negroes, Indians, and mulattoes, &c. shall be slaves—except those *then free*.

2d. That in every trial it shall be presumed that every negro and mulatto is a slave until he *proves* the contrary. We hardly see how a more precise description or direction could be given. The rules may be short, but they speak with "irresistible clearness," leave no case unprovided for, and sweep all clean before them. All of a certain race are slaves, and in case of any doubt, they are to be *presumed* slaves till the contrary is *proved*. Surely there never can be any doubt or hesitation in any Court how to act under such rules; provided always a Court can be found base enough to act at all under such an accursed system. Indeed the system of Slavery will never be successfully attacked by objections like these. In cold, calculating *systematic* plan and foresight, the slaveholders of this, as of every other country, have always been distinguished. The people have seldom regained their freedom by finding a loose joint in the harness of their tyrants; no, it has usually been necessary to trample armor and armor-wearers together in the dust.

Mr. Spooner says, "the fact that Slavery was *tolerated* in the Colonies, is no evidence of its legality." This is true, on his supposition that custom is no legal or competent source of system, a doctrine which he tries, but in vain, to deduce from Lord Mansfield's language. Having shown the unsoundness of his view of the meaning of "positive law," the above assertion falls also to the ground. Toleration or acquiescence is what gives force, effect, and legal validity to custom, especially when such customs are recognized by legislative action.

5th. "The Declaration of Independence abolished it."

In reply, we have only to say that the Declaration had nothing to do with Slavery. That paper "dissolved the political bands" that bound the Colonies to England, and that was all it did, or it was intended to do. No Court has ever held it to be the "fundamental law" of the country. On the contrary, it is simply a State paper, a political act,—changing the form of government, and having no relation to individual rights. We cannot better describe the *legal* character of the Declaration, that given to it by the Courts of the country, than in the words of J. Q. Adams.—(Oration at Quincy, 1831, p. 20.)

"The Declaration of Independence asserted the rights and acknowledged the obligations of an independent nation. * * *It made no change in the laws*—none in the internal administration of any one of the Confederates, other than such as necessarily followed from the dissolution of the connection with Great Britain. *It left all municipal legislation*, all regulation of individual rights and interests to the people of each separate colony. Each separate colony thus transformed into a State of the Union, wrought for itself a Constitution of Government."

6th. The Articles of Confederation do not refer to Slavery; and the State Constitutions of 1789 are either inconsistent with the existence of any such institution, or wholly silent about it.

This is Mr. Spooner's last point. The Articles of Confederation speak of "free inhabitants," and "free citizens." The *natural and obvious* meaning of this language is inhabitants and citizens not enslaved. This we have shown, and in fact Mr. Spooner allows it. He tries to affix a technical meaning to the word "free." It is true the word has a technical meaning, as we have before stated, when used alone, or with "*men*," as in "free men:" but never, we believe, when joined with "inhabitants," or "citizens." However, the question whether the Articles of Confederation did, or did not, speak of slaves, is of no consequence. We shall leave it, merely remarking that any plain reader of them will at once say that they do: and that is the best evidence that the fact is so.

We have reached, then, the State Constitutions of 1789. At that time Slavery existed in the midst of the nation; was tolerated by the acquiescence of the whole people, and known to all as a *great fact*, a prominent part of their social arrangements; recognized by the sovereign power of Parliament; established, regulated, and defined by repeated Statutes of the Colonial Assemblies.

Suppose that Mr. Spooner's assertion be true, and that in such a state of things, these Constitutions did not allude in any way to Slavery: what, then? Does that prove that the system could not exist after such Constitutions are adopted? Not at all. These Constitutions, many of them, at least, if not all, make no allusion, whatever, to property in land—to the rights of marriage—to the right of a father to his infant son's earnings—to a man's property being answerable for his debts—some, that of Virginia for instance, make no provision for raising taxes or even punishing crime—are all these things, therefore, *unconstitutional*? Certainly not. Polygamy is not forbidden in any one of them. Is polygamy therefore legal? No, these Constitutions do not attempt to regulate, describe, or even notice the organic skeleton of social life,—the granite ribs of the social globe. They take that for granted, and proceed to erect upon it (suffer us to change the figure) as upon a recognized and well-known foundation the more changeable framework of a Government. That the union of one man and one woman make marriage—that land may be owned and sold—that creditors may sue and debtors must pay—these things and others, *the customs and usages of the race, for which the Constitution is intended*, are taken for granted. It is not specially provided that Court proceedings shall be in English, or that laws shall be printed in that language. All these things are presumed, as according to the well-known rule of law. Statutes are to be interpreted according to the *subject matter*, so Constitutions are unintelligible unless we know first the race, usages, time, country, and general institutions, for which they were intended.

Now, suppose that our Constitutions had taken Slavery, one great American Institution, for granted, as they did the other "*great facts*" of social life, there would have been nothing wonderful in such an occurrence. Unless we found some *express* abolition of the system, or some clause equivalent to it, it would have continued as before. It was the first line in the Massachusetts and New Hampshire Constitutions, "all men are born free," that abolished Slavery in those States. Blot that out and the omission elsewhere to mention Slavery would have been no bar to its existence. The abolition of so gigantic and deep-rooted a system is never "done in a corner," or by stealth. It is preceded by an agitation sufficient to shake a continent, by long and angry discussion, by convulsion and fierce resistance; and when the long-dreaded and long-wished moment comes, "the boldest holds his breath for a time." Where were all these characteristics of such an event in 1776, or 1789? when, as Mr. Spooner thinks, one fine morning, folks waked up and were agreeably surprised to find the system gone, although they *all designed and expected its abolition!*

Again; Mr. Spooner says that the Constitution of Virginia commences with the declaration "that all men are by nature equally free,"—and this would abolish all the slave laws of that State. True, it ought to do so. Suppose it had: he has only, by this means, got rid of *one slave State*. There are plenty more to which the pro-slavery clauses of the Constitution can apply. The presence of one slave State in the Union is, morally, as bad as the presence of a dozen. But the question now is, not what *we* think *ought* to be the result of certain provisions in the Viriginian Constitution; but *what is* the interpretation given to it by that Court, which, and WHICH ALONE is authorized to construe it; the Supreme Court of Virginia.

The reader will recollect that Mr. Spooner is attempting to show that the United States Supreme Courts have, *according to the rules of law*, authority to declare all the slaves in this nation free. One reason why he thinks so is, that the slave laws of Virginia conflict with her Constitution and are, therefore, void. Now it happens that the Supreme Court of that State do not think so. And the Supreme Court of the United States hold that they have no right to reverse or control the decisions of State Courts in relation to such a question, "to declare State laws void although they may be repugnant to the Constitution of the State." (See Story I. Comm. 3. 701.) Especially is this the case in questions affecting property. (5. Peters 291, and the note 6. Peters C. R. p. 498.)

However, this question as to Virginia is unimportant. If we grant Mr. Spooner all he asks, it only rids us of *one slave* State, and there were five more in 1789.

But, lastly, the State Constitutions do refer to and recognize Slavery. Virginia speaks of "our negroes," &c. as we have above quoted. Interpreted, as that must be, by the usage of that day, it refers to slaves. So of Pennsylvania, and her mention of "slaves," quoted by Spooner. Maryland and South Carolina specially provided for the continuance in force of all laws not repugnant to the new Constitutions, and there is nothing in them repugnant to Slavery. Mr. Spooner, on his supposition that the old Charters did not warrant Slavery says there were no *valid laws* in South Carolina and Maryland to be continued. We have before disposed of this argument, and shown that those laws were valid and consistent with the Charters; consequently they were continued; indeed, whether so consistent or not, having always been considered "*laws*," up to that time, and *all laws* being continued, it seems to us any Court would hold, and common sense would ratify the decision, that those were *the laws* which the SOVEREIGN PEOPLE, the makers of the Constitution, and not bound even by Charters, intended and *had the power* to re-enact and continue. All laws "not repugnant to the Constitution" were continued. It mattered not, *then*, how repugnant they might have been to the old Charter.

The use of the word "*free*" also in those Constitutions shows the same thing. We have sufficiently exposed Mr. Spooner's rash and unfounded assertions as to this term in a former number; we shall not repeat what we there said. Neither shall we go over all the slave State Constitutions. It would require too much space. We simply state that the word "free," had been sometimes used technically: and still was so, but not usually in the slave States—there the primary meaning was preserved to distinguish the class not enslaved. We shall confine ourselves to one State; one is enough to sustain our argument and our space forbids us to enlarge. We choose South Carolina.

South Carolina, (then including North Carolina,) early recognized Slavery. Her celebrated Constitution, drafted by JOHN LOCKE, and which went into operation in 1669; and continued till 1693, provides that "every freeman of Carolina shall have absolute power and authority over his negro slaves, of what opinion or religion soever."

The sanction thus early given was continued by successive legislation down to the Revolution. The Constitution, adopted March 26, 1776, provides, by reference to a former statute, that "free white men, having in their own right five hundred acres, and at least twenty slaves," shall be eligible to office. Here again was a distinct recognition of Slavery. In October 1776, the number of slaves necessary was reduced to *ten*. This Constitution continued till 1778, when the one from which Mr. Spooner quotes was adopted, which remained in force till 1790. In this, all direct mention of slaves was dropped. In the Constitution of 1790, the State returned to her old policy, and made the holding of "*ten negroes*" one of the qualifications for a seat in her Legislature. Still, the Constitution of 1778, from which Mr. S. quotes, speaks of "every free white man" &c. Mr. S. says this word "free" has no reference to Slavery. Let us see. The clause is copied from the Constitution of 1776, and that from laws which had been in force for half a century. In all those, the "*free* white man," is the holder of *twenty slaves*," "*ten slaves*," &c. &c. *In that connection* there could be no doubt what was the meaning of the word "*free*." It meant the class that held slaves, and was used to distinguish them from their slaves. The reader will remember Lord Mansfield's rule, the universal rule, that ambiguous words are to be taken to mean what they have *clearly* meant in *other similar laws*. This consideration fixes *beyond a doubt*, the true signification of the word in this place.

Mr. Spooner says "free," in this connection, ("free *white* man,") cannot be the opposite of slave, because it would imply that some *white* men might be slaves. This objection would never have been brought by an Abolitionist. Such know too well by Southern advertisements, Southern law cases, aye, and by the recent action of the Carolina Legislature, how often "*pure white*" men are found in chains.

Finally, suppose any of the slave States were deficient in valid slave legislation in 1789; they have made up for it since. Their Constitutions now are full of Slavery. But, says Mr. S. they cannot enslave people, once free. Who will prove this? We assert, and challenge a contradiction, that Pennsylvania may, in perfect *consistency with the United States' Constitution*, recreate Slavery today. No clause in that instrument forbids any of the old thirteen States from setting up Slavery, if any one is mad enough to wish it; and once established, it could claim the benefit of all the pro-slavery clauses as fully as the more ancient wickedness of the Old Dominion or of Carolina. It is idle therefore to waste time in ferreting out the precise condition of the Constitutions of 1789. That is a very immaterial point. Indeed the whole discussion is a waste of time. The Constitution of the United States deals with Slavery as a *fact*, and gives it, as such, certain rights. Such is the general rule as to *ante-constitutional* matters. (See Story, 1. 206.) The Constitution no more undertook to decide whether Slavery was *legally* planted here, than it did to determine whether the Indians had the best original title to this soil five hundred years ago—before it gave Congress the right to regulate commerce with them, &c. Suppose it should turn out, that those tribes had no legal right here, it would not alter the force or meaning of the constitutional provisions respecting them.

We close here our protracted review of this essay. The only apology we can offer to the readers of the Standard for occupying so many of their columns, is not the ingenuity of the argument—though that we are willing to confess, in Mr. Spooner's favour, deserves some credit,—but we were told that the book, hoisted into undue notice by the loud vaunts of unthinking friends, was misleading worthy men, whose want of time or scanty acquaintance with the subject, or too high opinion of its critics, prevented them from fully seeing the unsoundness of the pretended argument. In general, we think the American Society may well take the Constitution to be what the Courts and Nation allow that it is, and leave the hair-splitters and cob-web spinners to amuse themselves at their leisure. Sufficient for us is our appropriate and gigantic work, of trying to convert a community which exults in being, and in being considered, the lover and the supporter of Slavery.—W. P.

A Coloured Clergyman in England.

By a communication in the (Philadephia) United States Gazette, we learn that the Rev. Stephen F. Gloucester of that city, is now in England, soliciting funds for the building of a church. He seems likely to meet with success, as the English people have a way of thinking that there is as much necessity for coloured people endeavouring to get to Heaven, as white, and that in some cases they will be much more likely to succeed. The writer in the Gazette copies a letter from Birmingham to the London Patriot, from which we make an extract. Were Mr. Gloucester to visit Dr. Patton's church, he would be put in that *right*-hand corner, which Mr. Page says is so near the Doctor's heart. We have no doubt that our Doctors of Divinity usually carry what hearts they have for the coloured people on their right sides:

The reception that he has met with here, has encouraged him to persevere in endeavouring to attain the assistance of British Christians towards the object he has in view. Last Lord's-day, he was introduced by the Rev. John Angell James to his pulpit, from whence, he delivered a simple, energetic, and affecting discourse to a crowded auditory, notice thereof having been previously given. The devotional part of the service was undertaken by the minister of Carrs Lane Chapel, who, after appropriate prayers, introduced the stranger to his people by a touching address, in which he expatiated on the pleasure it gave him to introduce a minister, not only from another country, but of another colour, to an assembly of British Christians. He remarked that *here* he would find that neither country, nor kindred, clime, nor colour, would prevent his being cordially received and acknowledged, not only as a man and as a brother, but as a fellow-Christian and a minister of Jesus Christ.

* * * * *

Next Sabbath evening, he has been invited to preach for the Rev. James Roberts, in Ebenezer Chapel; and it is hoped that the effects of these services will extend far beyond the narrow limits of this town or this locality.

WITHDRAWAL FROM THE LIBERTY PARTY.—The Western Citizen of Chicago, contains a letter from Mr. Seth Paine

vantage, but from motives entirely benevolent, and those who hold their fellow-creatures in bondage for the sake of gain; and that the former are to be regarded as entitled to fellowship, while the latter cannot be received as members of this Alliance."

This might possibly exclude Hope H. *Slaughter*, and the enterprising tradesman whose advertisement of "FANCY GIALS" may be found in the letter of our New Bedford correspondent, but hardly another one of the slaveholders of the South. Not one of them would acknowledge that he held his slaves by his own fault. How can they, when, as the Rev. Sidney E. Morse says, the fault belongs to their English ancestors. The guilt of Slavery lies with the past, and repentance for it with the future. Neither will any of them allow that they are governed by any other than purely benevolent motives in holding slaves. They are not able to take care of themselves, and nothing but the most self-denying and Christian charity actuates their masters in pocketing their wages, and giving them a peck of corn a week, a floorless hut, and one suit of negro-cloth a year, as food, lodging, and raiment. We doubt if a slaveholder in the land can be found so unreasonable as to complain of the dressing which the Rev. Dr. Cox and his associates have given to this camel to make the swallowing easy for Southern throats.

Mr. Goodell's Letter.

We refer those who think any reply is necessary to the various points brought up again by Mr. Goodell, to the Review of Mr. Phillips, which is finished in this week's paper. It would be presumption in us to travel over the same ground again so immediately, even were there more force in Mr. Goodell's arguments than there now appears to us to be.

As to what Lord Brougham may think on the particular question in dispute, whether Slavery be legal or not, we presume Mr. Goodell knows as much as we do, and no more. Of this particular point, as it is presented just now in this country, we doubt if his Lordship has ever heard. We by no means deny the importance and ingenuity of Mr. Goodell's labours to prove black, white, but we very much question whether Lord Brougham has ever read his pamphlet. We take it that all he meant to say in the passage quoted was, that Slavery was morally wrong, notwithstanding it was legally valid:

"Tell me not of rights," he says—"talk not of the property of the planter in his slaves. I deny the right—I acknowledge not the property. The principles, the feelings of our common nature, rise in rebellion against it. Be the appeal made to the understanding, or to the heart, the sentence is the same that rejects it. In vain you tell me of laws that sanction such a claim! There is a law above all the enactments of human codes—the same throughout the world, the same in all times—it is the law written by the finger of God on the heart of man; and by that law, unchangeable and eternal, while men despise fraud, and loathe rapine, and abhor blood, they shall reject with indignation, the wild and guilty fantasy, that man can hold property in man!"

We do not think anything more is necessary than to quote again the passage. Lord Brougham is talking of the "wild and guilty fantasy" that man can rightfully hold property in man. "In vain you tell me of *laws that sanction* such a claim!" He acknowledges expressly the existence of such laws, but denies that they can make Slavery morally right. We will not insult the understandings of our readers by arguing upon so plain a point.

NEW BEDFORD LYCEUM.—We are glad to learn, by a private letter from New Bedford, that the Lyceum have rescinded their Black Law. The coloured people may now buy tickets and sit where they please. We congratulate our New Bedford friends upon this triumph of the right in their local politics.

MRS. PAULINA S. WRIGHT commenced a course of lectures in this city, at the Society Library, on Monday last, on Anatomy and Physiology.

DEMOCRACY IN ILLINOIS.—Mr. J. B. Jackson, of Chicago, was kicked out of a Democratic meeting, and brutally beaten by a mob, for venturing to ask several questions touching the qualifications of the nominees of the party. It does not seem that there was anything offensive in the questions themselves, but Mr. Jackson was denounced while speaking, by some one who recognized him, as an Abolitionist, and in answer to his very proper questions, he was kicked and beaten to the ground, and only escaped from these equality-loving Democrats wounded and bleeding.

CHARTER ELECTION.—The result of the election in this city, is a Whig Mayor and Corporation for the ensuing year.

THE BALTIMORE SATURDAY VISITER is discontinued, and its subscription list is to be added to that of the National Era, at Washington. Dr. Snodgrass, we understand, is to be also in some way connected with the Era. We regret the loss of the Visiter, as it was, we have no doubt, doing a good work in Maryland.

DONORS.—We find upon our list of pledges made at the last annual meeting, the names of several persons who have not yet paid the amount, so generously offered for the support of the Society for the current year. We would remind those friends that the year is near its close, and that the present time is the season of the greatest need of the Society. Those who will redeem their pledges now, will have chosen a good time to do so.

From our New Bedford Correspondent.

Foster and Pillsbury in New Bedford—State of the Cause—Phillips a dangerous character—Cotton-Whigs—Who Annexend Texas?—Benefits of the War to the aforesaid Whigs—The Prayer of a "Traitor"—Waiting on Providence—Denunciation—Despotism in Russia; and at the South—Foster not severe enough—A Letter to come—the writer judgeth the readers of the Standard—Weak brethren—Mr. Calhoun—his Speech in Charleston.

NEW BEDFORD, April 1, 1847.

DEAR GAY:—S. S. Foster and Parker Pillsbury have just concluded a series of meetings here, with small success, however. This was partly to be attributed to local circumstances, and partly to the same obstacles which meet our efforts now everywhere. The greatest of these of course is our Disunion position. I suppose that an Anti-Slavery feeling, such as we should once have been satisfied with, is now more prevalent at the North than we generally imagine. Concessions as to the intrinsic wickedness of Slavery, and the necessity of doing it away, acknowledgment of the corruption of the Church, and of the profligacy of political parties are now everywhere to be had for the asking. Yet the distance between us is as great as ever; and those who formerly stumbled at what are now truisms, universally received, stumble now at our doctrine of "No union with slaveholders." Sooner or later we shall drag them up to it. Truth is a strong horse, and it is a satisfaction to think how far it has carried us on our journey even though Disunion now thins our meetings, and *seems* to hinder our success.

It is another sign of progress that our opponents no longer dare to meet us openly, sometimes even to hear us. I have known of people who said when asked if they were going to hear Phillips, "No, I am afraid to. I know he will convince me." The feeling, I suppose, is of this sort:—"I know I'm wrong, but this state of things will *last my day* if I don't disturb it, and then let posterity take care of itself." This is the paltry, contemptible feeling which now actuates a great part of Northern pro-slavery. It is not that they don't know better. It is not that they do not know that the evil is daily and hourly accumulating. But it will *last their day*—they can even make money out of it, and who cares for what will happen afterward? Not they. Who doubts that when the cotton interest of Boston set itself against the anti-Texas movement, it did not know perfectly well what it was doing? Men talk of Liberty party annexing Texas. Liberty party has sins enough of its own to answer for. It was Boston cotton-Whigs who annexed Texas, for if they had spoken out, and led the movement that Massachusetts was ready to make, instead of crushing it, underhand, as they did, Texas never would have been annexed. Why did they act thus? Because they hoped by it to make the Union *last their day*, and go on making their millions at Lowell, and who cares for what comes afterward? I will not say that these honourable gentlemen *consciously* argued thus to themselves—doubtless they thought themselves good patriots, though that is a hallucination little short of insanity—but I mean that, consciously or unconsciously, this was their real feeling, and that it is the feeling of thousands of business men at the North, who don't want their trafficing interfered with. This is what makes them so patient under the kicks and insults of the South. What care they for being kicked? Do they not put *money* in their purse? What care they that slaveholders hold the reins of power and fill all offices of trust? They would not fill them if they could, except now and then to make a protective Tariff, or something of that sort. They are too busy putting money in their purse. What care they for the annexation of Texas? Yet they do care for that, for it "opens a new market," and puts money in their purse. What care they for Mexican wars? They are up their old ships, and by and by will make a protective Tariff necessary to pay a national debt; and is not that worth the murdering of a few thousand miserable Mexicans in lawful war? To be sure the war was not very lawful in the eyes of Whigs at the beginning, but do not men called ministers of the Gospel tell us that now that the Government has got us into it, the war is right and lawful, and ought to be furthered and assisted by all good citizens until the Government gets us out. For my part, I am so far a "rebel" and "traitor," that I pray God, that if blood must be shed it may be the blood of the piratical crew who have gone, under the sanction of Massachusetts, to rob an unoffending neighbour; if battles must be fought, that it may be the armies of this plundering and God-defying nation that may meet with confusion and defeat. Better for humanity a thousand times that every American who has set his foot on Mexican soil, aye, and every American anywhere who defends and supports the iniquitous war, should perish, than that the curse of Slavery should be again established where it has once been abolished.

While Northern commerce flourishes Slavery will not be abolished. God grant that the day may soon come—and in the natural course of events it soon will—when slaveholding misrule shall bring trouble and dismay into all Northern counting-houses, and leanness upon all Northern purses. Then will Northern eyes be opened to see that Slavery is a sin which *must* be abolished. There is a sort of twaddle I have sometimes heard from Northern do-nothings, which I do not remember to have seen noticed. Slavery came, they say, in the providence of God, and in God's good time it will be abolished, by overruling laws of providence over which we have no control. We may talk and bluster, we shall neither hasten nor hinder it. I think it was with some such hypocritical stuff as this that Clay answered Mr. Mendenhall. What an interesting argument to apply to any other similar case! Piracy came in the providence of God, and in his good time, &c. Meantime we must submit to have our throats cut, and be plundered of our goods, till "the course of events" shall abolish piracy. Our philosopher doubtless waits for "overruling laws" to drain his marshes, fell his forests, and build his railroads. God's good time! Alas, no friend! We owe it to your cowardly neglect of duty that Slavery can no longer be abolished in "God's good time"—but must be abolished now in the devil's evil time. God offered us his good time, and we refused it. He offered it again and again, and we refused it. We might have put the evil from us when it was small, and all things conspired to help us; now we must put it from us when all things conspire *against* us, and because it will destroy us if we do not. The wound that might have been salved is now become a frightful cancer, destroying our very life; for what is the life of a nation but its moral power, and what nation so dead in hideous trespasses and sins as we are?

I meant when I began to write not this, but something about our friends' lectures, and particularly about their "denunciation," and it will come in fitly here, for friend Foster, in one of his lectures, entered into an elaborate defence of the proposition with which I ended my last paragraph. Taking the Government of Russia, as the one generally considered the most despotic in the world, he argued, and he *proved* that it does not come near our "freest and most enlightened republic in the world," in tyranny, barbarity, and brutal despotism. I say he proved it, and I challenge any one to disprove the position that the Government of the United States has now the unenviable distinction of being the most tyrannical and despotic under the sun. Let me adduce some of the proofs. The Government of Russia neglects to provide education for its subjects, and therein is wanting in the true duties of a Government. But the Government of the United States *prohibits*, under penalty of imprisonment, and even *death*, one-sixth part of its people from learning to read. Yes, nearly one-sixth of the people of the United States, at this moment, and by laws which we, who "send the Bible to the heathen," sanction and connive at, and support with our *moral* influence and our military force, are forbidden to read so much as a letter of the Bible. What despotic edict of what despotic ruler comes up to this? Again; the serfs of Russia belong to the soil on which they are born, and are subject to its owner's power, but no master has the right to sell them from that soil, tearing asunder families, and violating every human feeling, as is done in our enlightened republic. I well remember the descriptions of a friend who had visited in Washington, of the agony in which a poor slave rushed into her host's house, and fell on her knees, beseeching him to purchase her. The slave-dealer was making his rounds, and she was in mortal fear least she should be sold from her children, away to the South. And this is done daily and hourly in the capital of our country, under laws which we—I mean which the North, you and I have foresworn them—makes, and supports, and sanctions. It was but last week that a poor fellow in this town, himself a fugitive, had to mortgage all the little property he had accumulated by some years of industry, to raise $800 to purchase his son in Baltimore, whom his master threatened to sell to Alabama. To *purchase his son* in a Christian republic.

Again; with all the power the Russian Lord has over his serfs, he cannot maim, and mutilate, and brand them. Nor can his subjects carry on such a trade as some of the following advertisements show. I copy a few of these evidences of the condition of the "happy and contented slave":

NOTICE OF A RUNAWAY SLAVE.

There was committed to the common jail of the county of St. Louis, as a runaway slave, on the 18th day of February, 1847, a negro man, named Jessie Keys, about fifty years old, six feet and a quarter of an inch high, *slightly marked on his back, supposed to be by the whip*, had on when committed, black cassimere pants, black cloth coat, black hat, and white cotten shirt, and says he belongs to John McCune, of the city of St. Louis. Said negro man was taken up in Union county, *State of Illinois*, by the Sheriff of said county.

The owner of said slave is requested to make application for him according to the form of the statute in such case made and provided, within three months from this date, and pay all charges incurred on account of said slave, otherwise I will on Thursday the twenty-seventh day of May next, between the hours of nine o'clock in the forenoon, and five o'clock in the afternoon, of that day, at the East front door of the Court-house in the city and county of St. Louis, State of Missouri, sell the said slave to the highest bidder for cash, pursuant to the statute in such case made and provided.

SAMUEL CONWAY,
Sheriff of St. Louis county, Mo.

St. Louis, February 29, 1847.

NEGROES FOR SALE.

I have again returned to this market with eighteen or twenty likely negroes. I have located on the corner of Main and Adams streets. I have plough-boys, men, women, and girls, and *some very fancy ones*. I intend to keep a constant supply through the season, and will not be undersold by any in market. My motto is, "the swift penny; the slow shilling," I never get.

I will also pay the highest cash price for young negroes. W. H. BOLTON.

November 21, 1846.

ONE HUNDRED "A NO. 1" NEGROES.

I have an hand, one hundred negroes, men, women, boys, and girls, at my depot in Gaine's brick building, immediately back of Howard's Row, between the Gayoso and Hegron house. I have judicious men purchasing in North Carolina, Kentucky, and Middle Tennessee, and will keep constantly on hand a large number.

Persons wishing to purchase will do well not to trade without first calling to see *my stock*.

J. S. CURTIS.

MEMPHIS, November 20, 1846.

ONE HUNDRED DOLLARS REWARD.

Ran away from the plantation of Nathan Pickett, Red River, a bright yellow boy, named Irvin. Said boy is about eighteen years old, *he is very light colour*, has *yellow hair, nearly straight*, and *yellowish eyes, two or three light scars on his forehead*; he is five feet five or six inches high, straight made, has rather a downcast look when spoken to; *he has a scar from a burn on his thigh or rump; he calls himself white*, and has been seen about the markets, and has made an attempt to get up the river. One hundred dollars will be given for his apprehension so that we can get him and proof against the person who harbours him, or fifty dollars for the boy alone.—*Piaycune, March*, 1847.

EDW. H. POMROY, & Co. 33 Common st.

TRUSTEE'S SALE.

Plantation and negroes in Washington county, Mississippi; and Yazoo city town lot and buildings. On Monday, the first of February, 1847, I will proceed to sell, by virtue of a certain deed of trust, executed 10th May, 1845, by Thomas J. Reed, to me, as trustee, and duly recorded in the proper county, and at the special instance and request of the creditors named in said deed, at public sale, to the highest bidder, *for cash*, on the premises, the following described lands, situated, lying, and being in the county of Washington, and State of Mississippi, and described as follows—to wit:

Sctien No. 3. &c. &c.

Also—one *undivided half* of the following named negroes, slaves for life, held jointly with the heirs of Baine, viz: Sophia, aged 45; Nancy, 35; Queen, 40; Jane, 19; Rachel, 11; Priscilla; Jenny, 60; Maria, 30; Lydia, 30; Amanda, 22; Edna, 30; Vina, 36; Betsy, 35; Ellen, 9; Peyton, 8; Bob, 4; Louis, 15; Chub, 8; Horace, 6; Louisa, 1; Jim, jr. 4; Mary, 4 1-2; Harriet, 6; Dick, 9; George, 5; Billy, 50; Jno. Brown, 36; Alexander, 40; Louis Johnson, 62; Hatton, 35; Jim, sen. 42; Frank 50; John, jr. or Little John, 16; John Mitchell, 47; Louis Davis, 40; Warren, 40; Ben, 36; Oliver, 40; Louis, jr. or Chas. Louis, 5; Lawson, 35; Sam, 19; Harvey, 21; Fleming, 6; Amy, 4; Bonaparte, 3; Catherine, (Queen's child,) 2.

And further, all the right, title, and interest of said Reads in and to the following named slaves, to wit: Henny and her three children, Dick, Jane, and Peter—together with all *the stock of horses, cattle, mules, hogs, and farming implements*, appertaining to said tracts of land, which is believed to be an entire estate in fee.

The above sale will be for cash, and I will convey to the purchaser only such title as is vested in me by said deed of trust.

W. S. MOUNT.

No postponement on account of the weather.—*Ibid.*

These are no "abolition lies." They can all be verified if any one pretends to doubt what every Southern newspaper will prove.

Did not friend Foster make out his case? Now I do not think so highly of his powers of vituperation, as to believe he can say anything too bad of such a system and its supporters. I grant he is not always wise in his manner of proceeding. He begins with flinging a handful of hard epithets at his opponents, and often loses his opportunity of justifying them. He does not understand a climax. He should unfold his arguments first, and deduce his epithets as a conclusion. If he will do this, no one can gainsay him. As to his saying anything too bad, it is not in him to do it.

I intend, some time, to write a letter in illustration of this mode of treating the subject, in support of the following propositions:—1st. That the United States Constitution is "a covenant with death and an agreement with Hell." 2d. That every voter, Whig, Democrat, or Liberty party, is, whether knowingly or not makes no difference, de facto a robber and a murderer. 3d. That the American Church is "a brotherhood of thieves." 4th. That what is called Christianity in America is a worse religion than Paganism or Mahometanism. My propositions, standing alone, will doubtless excite only a smile among those for whose benefit I specially intend them—they will be called mere rant and blackguardism; but if I can bring them in as the conclusions of irrefragible arguments, I apprehend they will wear a different aspect. This I will try to do, though I am aware that such a letter must be to many of your readers only a letter of "truisms." Yet I should have in view another class of your readers—the half-converted—those who cannot go the Liberator, with its rough and unpleasant way of telling the truth, and its ugly print of "doings at Washington," but who can bear a paper that is a grain more genteel and refined. These are people of *feeling* but not of *principle*—whose heart is bidding them serve God and do their duty in this matter, but whose selfishness gets the better of their feelings, and so they try very hard to serve God and Mammon too, and read the Standard as a sort of salve to their consciences, and a proof that they are as much opposed to Slavery as any body. I think you must have a good many such readers—men who continue to vote with their parties, yet do it with an uneasy conscience—hangers-on of the Church, who yet more than half believe in its hollowness and corruption, and yet again are afraid to break with it openly, for fear of losing their "respectability." I would they were either hot or cold. I had rather they would do their best against us as open and decided opponents than remain there, lukewarm, undecided donothings. We are not afraid of *any* opposition. We *cannot* be overcome, for Truth is with us; but we do fear that criminal indifference that says I go, and goes not.

Have you read Mr. Calhoun's Charleston speech? One cannot help admiring Calhoun for his open, straightforwardness. He knows what he wants, and takes the shortest road to reach it. We never have two faces—no writing of one letter for one quarter and another for another—no Plymouth rock talk for the North, and "October Sun" talk for the South. Mr. Calhoun is the *open* champion of Slavery, and by it he means to live or die. 'Tis a pity there's such a thing as a difference between right and wrong in the world. If it were not for that Mr. Calhoun would be a great and a successful Statesman. His only difficulty is—not want of power, not want of honesty—it is simply that he is contending with the laws of God, and so *must* lose his labour.

His speech is very instructive. He describes and classifies, with great truth, the people of the North. He has made but one mistake, in omitting a class which his mind furnished him with no means of understanding, or even of perceiving. He speaks of the "abolition party," as if there were none but political, voting Abolitionists. He gives them more credit for thorough principles than they deserve, and greatly over-estimates their numerical strength in rating them at five per cent. of Northern voters. But he should learn that he has a far stronger opponent at the North than they; an opponent utterly insignificant in point of numbers, not a half, nor a tenth per cent. and yet an opponent that is, sooner or later, to bring all his councils to naught—an opponent so small as to be beyond the reach of his vision, and yet one that can rock the land from one end to the other. For they have the truth on their side, and their power lies in being her unflinching advocates, and her uncompromising and *consistent* supporters. For the same reason that Mr. Calhoun is strong because he is the *consistent* defender of evil, they are infinitely stronger because they are the *consistent* defenders of good. Because the Constitution is a slaveholding instrument, they refuse to support or recognize it, and by that simple act of consistency they exert a power greater than any number of inconsistent voters. Mr. Calhoun makes a grievous mistake when he thinks that all the "rabid fanatics who think Slavery a sin," can be "courted" into supporting one or the other of the political parties. There is an influence here at work against his institution, different from that, which he knows not of, or how to measure.

The rest of his classification is sagacious and correct. He thinks the class small at the North, who really defend Slavery, and looks upon it as "an institution, and the only one by which two races so dissimilar as those inhabiting the slaveholding States can live together nearly in equal numbers, (?) in peace and prosperity, (!) and who consider that its abolition would end in the extirpation of one or the other race—who, if they regard Slavery as an evil, regard it so *in the abstract*, just as Government, with all its burdens, labour, with all its toils, punishment, with all its inflictions, and thousands of other things are evil when viewed in the abstract, but far otherwise when viewed in the concrete, because they prevent a greater amount of evil than they inflict, as is the case with Slavery as it exists with us!" We too should think that the number now at the North who can honestly believe such absurd sophistry is very small indeed.

But hear his description of the third class. "The remaining class is much larger, but still relatively a small one, less than twenty per cent. of the whole, but possessing great activity and political influence in proportion to its numbers. It consists of the political leaders of the respective parties, and their partisans and followers. *They for the most part are perfectly indifferent about abolition, and are ready to take either side, for or against, according to the calculation of the political chances: their great and leading object being to carry the elections, especially the Presidential, and thereby receive the honours and emoluments incident to power, both in the Federal and State Governments.*" And again, after speaking of "the Lowells and the Walthams," "Boston and New York," he says: "Fortunately the crusade against our domestic institution does not originate in hostility of interests. If it did, the possibility of arresting the threatened danger, and saving ourselves short of a disruption of the Union, (which Mr. C. knows, none better, would be the deathblow to his "domestic institution,") would be altogether hopeless, *so predominant is regard for interest in those States over all other considerations.*" Right, Mr. Calhoun! Give the Democrats their share of the "spoils," keep the pockets of the Whigs full, and you need not despair of being President. Slavery may yet last your day, and South Carolina may have Massachusetts to kick till she is weary of the exercise.

Mr. Calhoun's plan of uniting the South upon *the* one great question, and outbidding the Liberty party, "Young Whigs," and "Independents," of the North, is a sagacious one—indeed the only one left to them. The next issue must be made fairly and openly on the question of Slavery, and the South knows it. God grant that this time the North may be faithful to herself and to humanity, that she may go no further in her career of wickedness and dishonour! A.

Notes on New Books.

The Life and Writings of Washington, by Jared Sparks. Harper & Brothers: 1847. Vol. 1, 8 vo.

The original edition of this great work was published in twelve volumes, at three dollars each; it had a very large sale even at that unusually high price for an American publication; it is now offered for just half the price, in the same number of volumes, and in equally elegant style, and we cannot doubt that its circulation will be more than doubled by the reduction in price. The work is so complete a history of Washington and his times, that it is not probable any other will ever be projected of equal magnitude.—B.

Lives of Eminent Individuals, celebrated in American History, 3 vols. 12 mo. Harper & Brothers: 1847.

This is a new edition of a very popular work, which was published in the series called the "School Library." The biographies were written by eminent pens, and are, generally, judiciously condensed from more diffused histories. There is a passion among Americans for reading the lives of their great men, and even the prophets whom they stone, they afterwards serve up in histories; as the Italian lover killed his favourite bird to make a dinner for his mistress. This must be the consolation of martyrs, when they are hung up to impromptu gallows, or rode upon a rail, or annointed with tar, and clothed with feathers, or starved in a garret, that they will be considered all the better subjects for future school-books and ponderous histories. When there shall be no more persecutions of modest merit, there will be no more biographies written. The age of persecution in this country has given immortality to certain names that otherwise would have been kept in obscurity by the unobtrusive goodness of their possessors. Let what will be said of the ingratitude of republics, America cannot be accused of neglecting her great men—after they are dead.—B.

To Correspondents.

H. W. C. We shall put a mark against his name which will render unnecessary for the future any such inclosures as that contained in his last letter. We trust he will send us names instead.

W. P. A. Don't be discouraged. Much obliged for the last. It shall be disposed of in due season. We shall be glad to hear that you are about such a work.

W. G. The acknowledgment was published according to the remittance. Presuming a mistake, however, the proper credit on the book was made to W. G. of T. G.

J. C. H. Presented and accepted.

J. D. of B. The name of the wrong county had been sent us, but we hope there will be no mistake in future as the book is corrected according to his letter.

F. C. S. The bill sent was for the ensuing year. We agree as to his account.

This Week's Paper.

FOURTH PAGE.—*Poetry*: Wellington and O'Connell; To the New-Year, 1847; Sonnets, &c. *Miscellaneous*: Toussaint (continued); The Little Match Girl—A Chrismas Story; Gleanings from Foreign Papers.

FIRST PAGE.—*Selections*: Delaware and Slavery; The Disunion Petitions. *Communications*: Letter from Wm. Goodell; G. F. White and the Rose Street Meeting; Letter from the Rev. Mr. Page.

GENERAL INTELLIGENCE.

Foreign.

War News—Capture of Vera Cruz and the Castle of San Juan de Ulua.

The intelligence of the surrender of Vera Cruz and the Castle to the forces under General Scott, was received in this city on Saturday, by express from Mobile to Montgomery, for the Herald, Tribune, and Sun, twenty-four hours in advance of the mail. The town was surrendered with little resistance, and the loss on the American side is reported as less than one hundred killed and wounded. The Mexicans are said, of course, to have suffered an immense loss. The disembarkation of the troops commenced on the 9th, and the city surrendered on the 26th. Out of the voluminous despatches of General Scott we select the following articles of capitulation as telling the whole story:

Articles of Capitulation of the City of Vera Cruz and the Castle of San Juan de Ulua.

PUENTE DE HORNOS,
Without the walls of Vera Cruz,
Saturday, March 27, 1847.

Terms of Capitulation agreed upon by the Commissioners, viz:

Generals W. J. Worth and G. J. Pillow, and Col J. G. Totten, chief engineer, on the part of Major General Scott, General-in-Chief of the armies of the United States; and Col. Jose Gutierrez de Villaneuva, Lieut. Colonel of the Engineers, Manuel Robles, and Col. Pedro de Herrera, commissioners appointed by General-of Brigade, Don José Juan Landero, commanding in chief, Vera Cruz, the Castle of San Juan de Ulua and their dependencies—for the surrender to the arms of the United States of the said forts, with their armaments, munitions of war, garrisons and arms.

1. The whole garrison or garrisons to be surrendered to the arms of the United States, as prisoners of war, the 29th instant, at 10 o'clock, A. M; the garrisons to be permitted to march out with all the honours of war, and to lay down their arms to such officers as may be appointed by the General-in-chief of the United States armies, and at a point to be agreed upon by the commissioners.

2. Mexican officers shall preserve their arms and private effects, including horses and horse furniture, and to be allowed regular and irregular officers, as also the rank and file, five days to retire to their respective homes, on parole, as hereinafter prescribed.

3. Coincident with the surrender, as stipulated in article one, the Mexican flags of the various forts and station shall be struck, saluted by their own batteries; and immediately thereafter forts Santiago and Conception, and the Castle of San Juan de Ulua occupied by the forces of the United States.

4. The rank and file of the regular portion of the prisoners to be disposed of, after surrender and parole, as their General-in-Chief may desire, and the irregular to be permitted to return to their homes. The officers, in respect to all arms and descriptions of force, giving the usual parole, that the said rank and file, as well as themselves, shall not serve again until duly exchanged.

5. All the *materiel* of war, and all public property of every description, found in the city, the Castle of San Juan de Ulua and their dependencies, to belong to the United States; but the armament of the same (not injured or destroyed in the farther prosecution of the actual war) may be considered as liable to be restored to Mexico by a definitive treaty of peace.

6. The sick and wounded Mexicans to be allowed to remain in the city, with such medical officers and attendants, and officers of the army, as may be necessary to their care and treatment.

7. Absolute protection is solemnly guaranteed to persons in the city, and property, and it is clearly understood that no private building or property is to be taken or used by the forces of the United States, without previous arrangement with the owners, and for a fair equivalent.

8. Absolute freedom of religious worship and ceremonies is solemnly guaranteed.

(Signed in duplicate.)
W. J. WORTH, Brigadier General,
GID. J. PILLOW, Brigadier General,
JOS. G. TOTTEN. Col. and Chief Engineer,
JOSE GUTIERREZ DE VILLANUEVA,
PEDRO MANUEL HERRERA,
MANUEL ROBLES.

Captain Aulick—appointed a commissioner by Commodore Perry on behalf of the navy, (the General-in-Chief not being able, in consequence of the roughness of the sea, to communicate with the navy until after commissions had been exchanged)—and being present by Gen. Scott's invitation, and concurring in the result and approving thereof—hereto affixes his name and signature. J. H. AULICK, Capt. U. S. N.

Headquarters of the Army of the United States of America, Camp Washington, before Vera Cruz, March 27, 1847.

Approved and accepted.

WINFIELD SCOTT.
M. C. PERRY,
Commander-in-Chief U. S N. forces Gulf of Mexico.

VERA CRUZ, Marzo 27, 1847.

Approbad y aceptado:
JOSE JUAN DE LANDERO.

A true copy of the original articles of capitulation.
E. P. SCAMMON.
1st Lieut. Topo. Eng's Act'g Aid-de-Camp.

General Scott has announced his intention of pushing immediately for the "Halls of the Montezumas." Santa Anna is said to be now in Mexico, and advising a Peace.

LATE FROM EUROPE.—By several arrivals since our last issue, our English dates are brought up to the 14th ultimo. There is, however, little news of moment. The corn market was dull. A motion to bring in a bill for the abolition of Capital Punishment has been defeated in the House of Commons. The Oriental and Peninsular Steam Company's ship Tiber, was lost on the 20th February, off Lisbon. Only one life was lost. The high price of provisions has caused some riots in Liege and Verviers.

LATE FROM LIBERIA.—We have received a file of the Liberia Herald by a late arrival. One of the papers is in mourning for the death of the Rev. A. W. Anderson. He died on the 10th of November last. At an election held on the 27th of October, the Colonists adopted the measure recommended by the American Colonization Society to form Liberia into an independent Government. A convention to form a Constitution is to commence its sittings on the first Monday in July, and the Constitution to be submitted to the people for their approval on the last Monday of September next.

The following is the only other item of interest that we find:

Captured.—A few days ago a slaver was taken between Shebar and Gallinas with five hundred and sixty slaves—which was augmented to five hundred and sixty-one by a birth which took place a few moments after the captors gained the deck. A decretion however soon occurred, as five of the unhappy wretches died before morning. Some idea may be formed of the way in which the slavers do the business, from the admission of the captain of the slaving vessel to the prize officer—that in *four hours* from the time he let go his anchor, he had taken in wood, water, and slaves, and was standing to sea.

General Items.

A pigeon Express is *flown* between Nantucket and New Bedford.

It is said (*by the Philadelphia North American,*) that Cooper received thirteen hundred dollars for his novel, now publishing in Graham's Magazine:—"The Islets of the Gulf."

A *Jar of Honey from Mount Hybla* is the title of a new work, shortly to be published,—from the pen of Leigh Hunt.

Several of the Hartford clergymen preached sermons against the Mexican war, on "'ta little Government Sunday, called 'ta Fast."

Trial for Sacrilege.—A slave was tried last week at Charleston, S. C. on a charge of sacrilege, for having robbed several churches of various articles, such as clergymen's gowns, Bibles, oil cans, and lamps. He was arraigned under a statute of King Henry the 8th, of England, which made death the penalty of the offence, but South Carolina law, which might have found no difficulties in enforcing the provisions of such a code upon a free black, shrinked at applying it to a slave who was an article of property. The court consisted of free holders and two magistrates, and one of the latter believed that this relic of nonsense and barbarism was still in force in the State. His opinion was, however, overruled, and the slave was only sentenced to be imprisoned two months, and to be twice publicly whipped, receiving twenty lashes at each interval.—*Boston Courier.*

The New England Society of New Orleans gave a supper to Col. Cushing, of Massachusetts, as he passed through that city to the halls of the Montezumas.

At a recent trial of one of the rent cases in Columbia county, the anti-rent association made a proposition to the landlords, that all the questions in dispute between them should be brought up and decided in a single case, and that both parties should abide by the decision. The landlords declined the offer.

In 1840, there were thirty-five thousand three hundred and thirty-one scholars at the primary schools in Virginia, while at the corresponding period, there were five hundred and two thousand three hundred and sixty-seven at the primary schools in the State of New-York.

Kentucky.—The Louisville Journal publishes an address of eighty-one gentlemen, seventy-nine of whom, are members of the late Legislature, in favour of a revision of a State Constitution. It adds, that fifteen members of the Legislature avowed themselves in favour of a convention and a change of the Constitution, but that for various reasons, they declined signing the address. The address contains the following paragraph:

SLAVERY.—We disclaim the intention, and state that we are not influenced by a desire to disturb the present relations which exist between master and servant.

Married,

In Winnebago county, Wisconsin, January 15th, Mr. JAMES WHITTEMORE to Miss ANN ELIZA, daughter of Col. B. Tuttle, of Ringwood, Ill.

Died,

In this city, on Sunday morning, April 4th, Mrs. MARY G. HOBART, widow of the late Rt. Rev. J. B. Hobart, in the 73d year of her age.

At Sandy Creek, Orange County, on the 29th ultimo, THOS. S. MEACHAM.

In Watertown, Mass. April 2d, NANCY M., widow of the late Henry Higginson, of Boston, aged 63.

In Portsmouth, on Tuesday last, JOSEPH CHILDS, Esq. formerly Lieut. Gov. of Rhode Island aged 79.

In Fall River, April 1st, Dr. J. SEXTON, aged 61 years. In the sudden and unexpected death of our friend, humanity has lost a sincere and efficient advocate. He early espoused and warmly supported the anti-slavery cause, giving liberally of the means with which he was blessed. In the discharge of his professional and social duties, he evinced a sacred fidelity to his conscience, as rare as it was ennobling to his character. The death of such a man, though calm and radiant with the hope of immortality, is a severe loss to his many friends, and the beneficent reforms which humanity is struggling to accomplish.—*Liberator.*

At Brooklyn, Long Island, Rev. WM. HARDEN, a well-known coloured, and blind, preacher.

On the 1st of April, at her residence in KNOXVILLE, Tennessee, MRS. ANN ELIZA WHITE, relict of the late Hon. Hugh L. White, for many years a member of the United States Senate from that State.

In Quincy, Illinois, March 11, Rev. GEORGE MOORE, Pastor of the Unitarian Society in that place, in his 35th year.

In Boston, the 7th instant, Samuel Wigglesworth, M. D. aged 35 years.

NOTICES.

NORFOLK COUNTY ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY.

The annual meeting of the Norfolk County Anti-Slavery Society, will be held at Dedham, in Temperance Hall, on Thursday, April 29th, at 9 o'clock A. M. Mr. Garrison and Mr. Phillips will be present, and it is hoped that Mr. Douglass will arrive in time to attend the meeting. Other speakers will be hereafter announced. It is earnestly hoped that there will be a strong rally of Abolitionists from every part of the county, and from other parts of the State. A meeting of unusual interest is anticipated. The Abolitionists of Dedham offer their hospitality to all those who may come up to this assembly.

EDMUND QUINCY, *President.*
INCREASE S. SMITH, } *Secretaries.*
ANNE M. WESTON, }

N. B. It is intended to hold an anti-slavery meeting on the preceding evening, (Wednesday 28th,) in the same place, of which further particulars will be given hereafter.

LOST CHILD.

Thornton Delany Parker, a small coloured boy about nine years of age, was decoyed from Pittsburgh during the absence of his parents some four months ago. He generally calls himself Thornton Delany.

The last they heard of the child, he had been a short time in Cleveland, Ohio, from whence he went to New-York State. Any information concerning him will be thankfully received by his anxious parents, HENRY & SARAH PARKER, Pittsburgh, Pa.

Direct the information to the care of the Editor of the Mystery, Pittsburgh.

WORCESTER COUNTY, MASS.

Worcester County North Division Anti-Slavery Society, will hold its next Quarterly Meeting at Gardner, on Thursday and Friday, the 15th and 16th days of April instant, commencing at 10 o'clock, A. M. Wednesday morning.

W. L. Garrison, and other advocates of the slave, will be present. A word to Old Fashioned, Old Organized, out-and-out Abolitionists is deemed sufficient. We shall be thrice glad to meet any and all who remember the slave in his bonds.

T. P. LOCKE, Secretary.

MEETINGS FOR C. L. REMOND AND J. C. HATHAWAY.

CHEMUNG COUNTY.
Elmira, Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday, April 13 14 and 15.

TOMPKINS COUNTY.
Ludlowville, Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday, April 19, 20, and 21.

Meetings to commence at one and half-past six o'clock, P. M. J. C. HATHAWAY.

3d mo. 9, 1847.

ANNIVERSARY IN MAY.

The friends of the abolition of Capital Punishment throughout the United States, are earnestly requested to be represented at the meeting of the New-York State Society, to be held in this city on Monday, May the 10th. Among the speakers expected to address this meeting, are Hon. Robert Rantoul, Wendell Phillips, John Pierpont, Horace Greeley, Rev. E. H. Chapin, Charles C. Burleigh, Parke Godwin, J. L. O'Sullivan, Rev. W. H. Channing, and Prof. Patterson, of Philadelphia.

JOSIAH HOPPER, Sec. W. T. McCOUN, Pres.

☞ Papers friendly, please copy.

Free Labour Dry Goods & Groceries.

WHOLESALE AND RETAIL.

FRESH and new goods just received, consisting in part of shirting and sheeting muslin, bleached and brown
Manchester ginghams of superior quality, various style s
2d quality do. assorted patterns.
Calico, do. do.
Colored cambries and Canton flannel, assorted colors.
Bleached and brown do. do. and table diaper.
Colored table-cloths, imitation of linen.
Cotton hdkfs. assorted styles.
Long and half hose, superior and heavy.
Apron and furniture check.
Cotton twilled pantaloon stuff.
Knitting cotton, various Nos. bleached, brown, and coloured.
Cotton laps and wadding, white and colo

Poetry.

From the New Timon.

WELLINGTON AND O'CONNELL.

Next with loose rein and careless canter view
Our man of men, the prince of Waterloo;
O'er the firm brow the hat as firmly prest,
The firm shape rigid in the buttoned vest,
Within the iron which the fire has proved,
And the close Sparta of a mind unmoved.
Not his the wealth to some large natures lent,
Divinely lavish even where misspent,
That liberal sunshine of exuberant soul,
Thought, sense, affection, warming up the whole;
The heat and affluence of a genial power,
Rank in the weed as vivid in the flower;
Hush'd at command, his very passions halt,
Drill'd is each virture, disciplined each fault;
Warm if his blood, he reasons while he glows,
Admits the pleasure—ne'er the folly knows;
If for our Mars his snare had Vulcan set,
He had won the Venus but escaped the net.
His eye ne'er wrong if circumscribed the sight,
Widen the prospect, and it ne'er is right;
Seen through the telescope of habit still,
States seem a camp, and all the world—a drill.

Yet, oh! how few his faults, how pure his mind,
Beside his fellow-conquerors of mankind;
How knightly seems the iron image shown
By Marlborough's tomb, or lost Napoleon's throne!
Cold if his lips, no smile of fraud they wear;
Stern if his heart still *Man* is graven there;
No guile, no crime, his step to greatness made,
No freedom trampled, and no trust betrayed;
The eternal "I" was not his law—he rose
Without one art that honour might oppose,
And leaves a human, if a hero's name,
To curb ambition while it lights to fame.

But who, scarce less by every gazer eyed,
Walks yonder, swinging with a stalwart stride,
With that vast bulk of chest and limb, assign'd
So oft to men who subjugate their kind?
So sturdy Cromwell push'd broad-shouldered on,
So burly Luther breasted Babylon,
So brawny Cleon bawl'd his Agora down,
And large-limbed Mahmoud clutch'd a prophet's crown.

Aye, mark him well! the schemer's noble eye,
The stage-mime's plastic lip your search defy—
He, like Lysander, never deems it sin
To eke the lion's with the fox's skin;
Vain every mesh this Proteus to enthrall,
He breaks no statute, and he creeps through all.
* * * * * *
In him behold all contrasts which belong
To minds abased, but passion's rous'd by wrong;
The blood all fervour, and the brain all guile,
The patriot's bluntness and the bondsman's wile.

From the London Inquirer.

TO THE NEW YEAR, 1847.

"My Father worketh, and I work."

And nobly did he toil, that workman brave,
And well performed the task he undertook,—
Wresting their prey from sin and from the grave,
As teach the records of that Holy Book.

Not as a king, o'er subject realms to reign;
Not to nurse self in soft, luxurious ease;
Not to accept vain homage would he deign,—
Nobler, more godlike, was his aim than these.

It was his Father's work Christ came to do;
It was his brother-man he came to raise;
He came our better nature to renew,
To change the sinner's mourn to hymns of praise.

On with his work, ye truly great, ye brave,—
Ample the harvest, but the labourers few;
Oh, there are millions yet to seek, to save,—
Much has been done, much yet remains to do.

Work is the worship of the working-days—
Labour with head, or heart, or toiling hands;
Christ taught, that not alone by Sabbath praise
Do we fulfil our Maker's high commands.

Work? There is work for every active hand,
For each warm heart that pities sin and woe;
Ye rich, ye powerful, join the willing band,—
Ye are God's stewards, be his workmen too.

What if even life be spent in doing good—
Say, was it given to pamper self in bliss?
Love, to the generous heart, is daily food,—
It lives alone in others' happiness.

"To scatter plenty round a smiling land,
To read your history in a nation's eyes,"
For this the call of luxury withstand,
Ye truly great, be this the fame ye prize.

Do ye not smile in every smile ye cause?
Do ye not live in every heart ye cheer?
Ye, who bring back the wanderer to God's laws,
Who aid the oppressed, who dry the mourner's tear.

Rich are ye, generous workers, in the love,
In the deep reverence of those ye save;
But, oh, how rich in treasures stored above—
Stored in God's treasury, beyond the grave,

J. A.

SONNETS.

BY REV. HENRY ALFORD.

I.

Weep ye and howl, for that ye did refuse
God's feast of bounties when most largely spread,
Sunrise and set, and, clustering overhead,
The nightly stars—for that ye did not choose
To wait on Beauty, all content to lose
The portion of the Spirit's offered bread
With which the humble wise are daily fed,
That grows from yielding things despised their dues;
Therefore your solitary hours unblest,
Shall not be peopled with the memories dear
Of field, and churchway path, and runnel clear;
Therefore your fading age shall not be drest
With fresh spring-flowers; because ye did belie
Your noblest life, in sorrow ye shall die.

II.

But deck the board; for hither comes a band
Of pure young spirits, fresh arrayed in white,
Glistening against the newly-risen light,
Over the green and dew-impearled land,
Blithesomely tripping forward, hand in hand;
Deck ye the board—and let the guests be dight
In the Gospel wedding-garment, rich and bright,
And every bud that summer suns expand:
For you, ye humble ones, our thickets bloom;
Ye know the texture of each opening flower,
And which the sunshine, and which love the gloom;
The thrill of poised lark for many an hour
Ye watch; and all things gentle in your hearts
Have place, and play at call their tuneful parts.

Opinion rules the human state,
And domineers in every land.
Shall sea or mountains separate
What God hath joined in Nature's bands?
Dwell they far off, or dwell they near,
They're all my Father's children dear.
Features and colours of the hair,
These all do meet in harmony;
The black, the brown, the red, the fair,
All tinctures of variety;
In single, simple love alone
These various colours are but one.

Anon, 17th Century.

Miscellany.

TOUSSAINT:
AN HISTORICAL ROMANCE.

From an unpublished Translation from the German of Theodore Mügge.)

CHAPTER XVIII.—[Concluded.]

Borel next stepped forward, calm and undaunted, and Blanchelande was embarrassed before his cold, measuring glance. "Sir Marquis," said he, politely, "I am sorry to see one of the most respectable men of this colony deprived of his liberty."

"And who has dared," cried Borel, "to lay his hand on a member of the Assembly, to disregard the sacred right of inviolability, and to treat me as a criminal?"

"But what else can be done," replied Blanchelande, gently, "if that member opposes the laws, if he excites lawless bands to violence on his own account, if finally, beaten and pursued he endeavours to reach Port-au-Prince, in order there, as a worthy successor of M. de Lavadeaux, who unluckily has escaped us and gone to America, to take the supreme command and kindle the civil war more violently than ever."

"As to this," said Borel, "I am accountable only to the National Assembly, who will decide upon all the charges made against me. I desire instantly to be set at liberty."

"Away with the Marquis to St. Marc's!" cried Blanchelande, who at this arrogance lost all patience and all thought. "There are light vessels enough at Goave to carry him to his judges."

He turned away, and the struggling Marquis was led off not without making some resistance. He cried out to the General, as he was hurried away, that he should repent what he was doing, and calling upon the bystanders to bear witness that personal violence was offered him.

"So we are quit at last of these unclean spirits," said Blanchelande, "and most gladly do I accept your proposal, my dear Rigaud, to enter your dwelling. I hope soon to quiet the South completely."

The mulatto General bowed low, but a scornful smile flitted over Augustin's countenance. "What a different tune do the birds sing now," whispered he to one of his friends; "only a few weeks ago and it was: 'the rebel Rigaud! the blood-thirsty monster! Ten thousand livres whoever will bring us his head!' and now it is, my dear Rigaud, I deem myself happy to breakfast with you."

"Is it not a merry drama that is acted in this great Foolshouse, called the world, as the old beggar Lamiel said, who alas died, without ever having witnessed the true, genuine folly. O men, men! It is the most pitiful work of God, and he made it after he had exhausted the best part of his power in the five days' work that went before. No," he added, "he shall not go without hearing from me a piece of news that shall spoil his appetite in the house of the yellow man."

With this Augustin stepped out of the thick group of officers, and approached the Governor-General, saluting him and his brother André with great respect. The latter, who had not perceived his presence before, called out: "Welcome, my Augustin; what has happened that brings you so unexpectedly from the South?"

"Would to Heaven," answered Augustin, "that I were the bearer of better tidings. My General, we implore your help: haste to Jacmel, to Cajes, to all the cities, for everywhere rages murder, fire, and death, in the most horrible forms."

The General looked at him with amazement. "How," cried he, "have not my messages of peace gone on before me? Have I not everywhere directed a commission of pacification to be appointed?"

"They want freedom," said Augustin, "full freedom, according to the decrees of the Convention, and it is refused us. War rages everywhere, and woe to him who is the weaker. The fury of the people knows no bounds. Acts have been done too horrible to be related, and to make the matter worse, bands of blacks in the high mornes of Lahotte have also begun a war of desolation."

The Governor-General grew pale with fear at this intelligence. He had supposed that all was over, and all disorder ended, and was expecting to travel South, with palm-branch in hand to play the beautiful part of mediator and peace-bringer; and now all at once he saw what a perilous war was to be engaged in.

André Rigaud, on the contrary, was hardly able to disguise the secret joy he felt at the increasing confusion of affairs. The words of the General, when he said that he hoped soon to quiet the South completely, had enabled Rigaud to see how readily his own influence would be lessened and his assistance dispensed with. But accustomed to conceal all his feelings under an impenetrable mask, he contented himself with merely uttering his favourite exclamation, and folding his hands with an air of sorrow, cried in a melancholy tone: "My God! my God! how terrible are the people in their wrath!"

Blanchelande soon recovered himself. "We must exhibit our strength and activity," said he. "Cruelties are practiced by all, and one goes beyond another. I will use all my authority to check the excesses of the white population. You, M. Rigaud, are the head of your brethren; you must repress this barbarism."

"I will try it," replied the cunning mulatto, with a sigh, "but how terrible is the people in their wrath!"

"Only a short rest here," said Blanchelande, "then we will start off and away to Cajes. The South must be quiet, if we wish to put down the North. If we do not succeed in that," added he, in a lower tone, taking Rigaud's hand, "we shall have the negroes and Spaniards for our masters."

"Or the free mulattoes," muttered Rigaud, aside, throwing open the door of his house to his distinguished guest.

CHAPTER XIX.

As Jumecourt caught the last contemptuous words of Antonina, he hastened off like a madman into the woods, full of wrath and chagrin. Rage and desire struggled together in his breast, and his self-love, wounded by a miserable mulatto woman, thirsted for satisfaction. The high mountain chains, which fill this narrow portion of the Island from Goave to Jacmel, are gloomy and wild. Primeval conflicts of giants, fire and water, have shivered these rocks, and piled them one upon another. Blue mountain spires, with bare, weather-beaten points, rise above the forests, and the lightnings of the tornado have scarred them with numberless white strips and seams. Earthquakes have rent off the cliffs and tumbled them into the valleys. Volcanic fires have raised the waters of the ocean, washed the soil from the coasts, and scooping out deep bays, have rolled into the rocky laps of the mountains depositing there their treasures of salt. But the wonderful magnificence and fertility of this land are here combined with the terrible and the sublime. It is a country full of flowing fountains, which come rippling from the bosom of the mountains, rushing down from the rocks, and passing through deep, dark, and mysterious ravines and valleys. Here the palm-groves spread out their fans; here the mountain-stream loses itself in clefts and caverns, and there they run prattling on again half hidden by flowers of rare species and by thick-rooted, blooming shrubs. Cool and shady grottoes formed the secret sleeping places of the animal world, where variegated snakes lay knotted together in heaps, basking in the hot sunbeams, or darting away at the approach of man. Jumecourt hastened away from valley to valley and from rock to rock, and at last paused upon one of the high steep blocks and saw the blue immeasurable sea lying on each side. In the far East hung clouds, behind which the coasts of Cuba lay concealed, before him the rugged domes and pinnacles of the mornes of Lahotte, in the South, the whole island with its gloomy mountain masses and forests, while around at his feet was presented a magical panorama of towns and cities on both coasts, and vessels floating like swans on the horizon, and plantations, which, waste and despoiled, showed their ruined roofs and blackened walls. From the South, came a distant thunder, whose death-announcing report awoke a hollow echo; he looked towards the rocky pass which wound a way through the chain of mountains, and saw a number of horsemen riding at a swift pace; it was Blanchelande, Rigaud, and their armed attendants, followed by a company of white and mulatto soldiers. It was a matter of little interest to Jumecourt whither they were going. Human passions and the charms of nature touched him not. He thought only of the mulatto woman who had scorned him, and stretching out his hand with a gesture of menace, cried: "She shall be mine, yes, assuredly, now, now, shall she be in my power!" He then fell to contriving how he should bring it about; and amid a thousand mad plans he could make no choice. In his irritation he grasped his long Spanish musket and pointed it at a vulture which rose, slowly and majestically out of some trees near by; but in an instant he let the weapon fall, and stood, as if transfixed, surveying with unquiet eye the place and the depth before him. The next moment he threw himself down flat upon the ground. He was upon a bare rocky cone, which on one side of him, descended almost perpendicularly some twenty or thirty feet, and then stretched out to a little Plateau, which was surrounded by a tolerably regular border of wild mountain pines. This little plain was overgrown with high grass, and no one would hardly have imagined that any other creature than, perhaps, one of the small tiger-cats, or one of the doglike jackals of the Antilles, now scarcely anywhere found, would have chosen his retreat in this desert spot, if the strange figure of a human being, whose shadow had first been descried by Jumecourt, had not been visible. It was a negro, who stepped forth well armed from under the rock; and it now first occurred to Jumecourt that it was dangerous to linger among these mountains, where one of the murderous bands of masterless slaves might so easily surprise him. But the inborn bravery of the Creoles and their contempt of these stupid creatures, as they were everywhere considered, was so great, that curiosity was awakened in the young nobleman far more than fear. He had an excellent musket, a dagger in his belt, and with this he was confident he could put to flight a dozen negroes, were he to throw himself suddenly in their midst. He lay, therefore, perfectly quiet behind a loose heap of stones, and by and by saw a company of persons half naked, arrayed in vari-coloured garments, which had evidently been a portion of their plunder, ascend out of a hole in the mountain, which seemed to have opened like the fabulous Sam-Sam, and vomited them forth. For the most part, they were powerful, muscular figures, and not all of unmixed African blood. The dirty gray-black of the Sakakra tribe, the Griffon, with the dark blue yellow complexion, and the Maraboo, with his light yellow black limbs and ugly cheek-bones, appeared alongside of the genuine son of the desert. Some dirty women and children squatted under a projecting rock, and a thin smoke, which lost itself as it rose out of a fissure, showed that in a subterranean kitchen, a meal was being prepared.

In the meanwhile the men had seated themselves in a circle on the grass in the centre of the space, and were engaged in a conversation, which was soon carried on with the characteristic vivacity of the African nature, with childish cries and gesticulations. The topic was nothing less than the division of their plunder. A dirty bag was emptied of its mingled contents of garments and utensils, useful and useless, blood-stained rags, and jewels set in gold, and a stout, dark-coloured Griffon distributed these various articles, maintaining a dignity which distinguished him at once as the leader of the band. It was a strange sight to see in what a peculiar way this singular fellow, wrapped in a sort of gown, allayed the quarrelsome dispositions of the party, and knew how to give himself the authority of a high priest. But the greatest reverence was paid him on all sides, and with the profoundest awe his followers looked upon their saint, who in every uncertainty invoked the immediate interposition of God himself and the holy Virgin as arbiters. The moment any quarrel arose, with outstretched arms he commanded silence, and then throwing himself on one knee, he covered his head with his gown, and broke out into certain inarticulate shrieking sounds, which passed either for a prayer or an adjuration. And then, after a moment's silence, he sprang up, and seizing the article in dispute, handed it to the individual, for whom, as he said, it was intended by the holy Virgin.

Jumecourt was the more diverted at this proceeding, as he suddenly recollected having a little while before heard of a fanatic negro band, who, profaning all the ceremonies of religion, started upon their plundering expeditions with hymns and prayers, and slaughtered their victims, carrying the crucifix before them. A mulatto slave, so it was reported, was at the head of this band, and had given himself out for their prophet, appointed by the holy Mother of God, and now, as if the fact were to receive full confirmation, Jumecourt heard just below him the howling voices of the blacks, as they kneeled and prayed, in a circle round the Griffon, and, crossing themselves, cried: "Holy Father, *Romaine-la-prophetesse*, tell us what shall we do, what the holy Virgin commands us; white men kill, yellow men kill, we will all do what thou sayest, Romaine-la-prophetesse."

The Griffon leaped up with a wild cry, and pointed to a grotto in the rocks. Two boys appeared, bearing something carefully wrapt in a velvet covering. As the negro took the velvet cloth and spread it out on the grass, a tabernacle became visible, which had evidently belonged to the high altar of some plundered church. It was a curiously wrought miniature edifice of acaja wood, inlaid with silver flowers, and adorned with images of saints. Romaine-la-prophetesse, threw himself down before it. His eyes grew wild, his hands were convulsively clenched. With great fervour, he kissed the corners of the little temple, the feet of the images, and the silver angels at the door, until at last, the door opened, apparently of itself, and then, with an expression of the deepest humility and self abasement, the black Priest put in his head. After some time, the Creole in his place of concealment, heard the voice of the black proceeding from this sanctuary: "Holy Mother of the Saviour," cried he, "hearken to thy servant, he prays to thee in the name of all thy faithful black children. They kiss thy feet, but they are naked and hungry, what shall they do to get bread, and to kill the white massas who hate thee and despise thy poor children?"

After he had for some time complained in a melancholy tone, and given an account of all their recent doings, he paused, and then began, to return an answer, in a voice wholly changed. It was ridiculous to hear how he endeavoured to soften his rough gutturals, and he succeeded, at least, so far, as to give an excellent imitation of that church tone, which the rogue must have caught at some earlier period from the disciples of St. Dominic.

"Hear! hear! my dear sons," so he went on; "now I descend from heaven and enter the soul of my dear Romaine, whom I have myself appointed as my prophetesse. Black man, remain faithful to me; yellow man, remain faithful to me; cursed be the white man, and cursed also be the yellow man, if he does not give to my dear black children, that they may eat, and drink, and dance. I tell you my black sons, I will march with you, and show you the houses of the bad massas, which you shall burn. A leader will come and tell you what you must do, to get money and wealth, he will show you the way how to bring your foes to the dust, and make their tears flow like the sea."

He would have gone on still longer if a thought had not suddenly flashed through the mind of Jumecourt, by which his violent nature was powerfully moved. The prophet of the holy Virgin had drawn his head out of the tabernacle, but his eyes were shut, and his face turned almost horizontally towards heaven, and his hands clasped as in fervent prayer. Now, as in his ecstacy, he turned his head, a glimmer of recognition broke upon the young nobleman. Yes, it was the same Romaine whom he had often seen during his residence on Rigaud's estate, and who, at a later period than many others, had escaped into the mountains. At this instant, a train of thought darted through the hot brain of Jumecourt, and without reflecting, he sprang up and shouted a wild halloo! to the group below, who, with a cry of surprise and alarm, huddled together one over another like a flock of sheep before a wolf.

The prophet himself passed at once out of a state of apparent unconsciousness into another, no less remarkable. He stared a moment at the apparition of the hunter, who held his long musket stretched out before him, then snatched up the tabernacle, and was about to plunge into the thickets with his treasure, when Jumecourt, with a loud voice, called to him: "Fool! black ass, Romaine, stir a step, and my bullet shall shatter your head. Come up here. My name is Jumecourt, the messenger and leader whom the holy Virgin has promised you, and through whom you are to earn the red gold. By the mother of all the blacks! I swear to you, I am alone, and you shall receive nothing but good from me, if you will serve me."

Romaine had in the meantime recovered from his terror, and when he saw that only one white man stood there who solemnly assured him that no troop of bood-thirsty massas followed him, he came slowly and cautiously nearer, and then clambered up the steep, and humbly approached the white man.

The two spoke together for some time, and the eyes of the prophet sparkled at the proposals which Jumecourt made him. The white man at last drew a rich purse of steel net-work, filled with gold, from his pocket, and tossed it to the slave, with a mixture of pride and contempt. "Take that," said he, "and fulfil my wish faithfully, and all shall be as I have promised."

The Griffon stared at him with a horrible grin, and nodded his head. "Massa shall be satisfied," said he. "Romaine-Riviere swears, he will ask the holy Virgin, his brethren will obey."

Jumecourt pointed to the sun, which was high in the zenith. "When that there sinks behind the mountain," said he, "then you must be there too."

"Massa, never fear," cried Romaine, "the prophet will come, the Mother of God has promised the leader to us, my brethren are pious men."

Disgust at the idea of association with such being was at this moment so powerful in the breast of the nobleman, that there was evidently a struggle in his breast, ere he came to a final decision. But suddenly he called out once more to the slave, that he would hunt him like game if he deceived him, and then he hastened away with all the agility of a practiced hunter.

Romaine looked after him until he vanished, and then he glided down the steep, having first carefully concealed the money. He called his scattered troop together addressed them again, fell into new ecstacies, and spoke out of the tabernacle with the voice of the holy Virgin. At last the women brought food, chiefly roots and the strong fermented juice of some root, which went round in a silver cup, a part of their plunder. As the sun began to go down, the men seized their arms, others wore cord of the palm-tree bark. And then, by hidden paths, they marched off towards the coast.

In the meanwhile Jumecourt had wandered far round, and slept away the hot hours in a deep cleft of the rocks. At last, with wavering and conflicting purposes, he proceeded towards the eminence on Rigaud's plantation, and his breast beat violently as he caught sight of Antonina's white dress, under the dragon-tree. But a revengeful pang deadened every other feeling when he saw at her side a man, with whom she appeared to be in close conversation. Softly crept the Creole behind the bushes, nearest to the two, and here he recognized the features of that proud, determined countenance. It was Petion, who was sitting with folded arms at the foot of the tree, his large, quiet eye turned to the sea, which lay calm and silent before him, a mirror of the immeasurable heavens and the setting sun. The numerous islands and bays, with their lively green, and the slender, dream-like palms, which hung from the rocks and eminences over the steep depths, the absence of all evidence of human life, the strange repose of the whole scene in the midst of the most furious passions, and the exquisite mixture of light and glancing colours even to the silvery blue atmosphere that floated round the mountain-heads of the distant mornes; all formed and contributed to a wonderfully vast and splendid picture. A reflection of the red sun-light glanced from the sea upon the heads of Petion and Antonina, and Jumecourt saw her lighted countenance, her love-speaking eyes, her hands clasped and raised almost in supplication to Petion, and then he heard her soft, clear-toned words, which only inflamed his passions with new violence.

"Let us part, my dear friend," said she. "How happy am I to have at last again opened my whole heart to you."

"My beautiful penitent," replied Petion, "had few sins to confess to me, which might not hope for full pardon."

"O! I am a creature that continually needs pardon with my ardent, and susceptible character, ready for a thousand contradictions and follies," replied she, with animation; "but my good friend knows how to excuse all. Yes, Petion, when I think how you, with your still loving heart, can yet take part in this bloody war, how you, a man of virtue and wisdom, can be a leader, who at the head of blood-thirsty troops, turns peaceful dwellings into ashes, and give up innocent human beings to death, I almost lose all sight of the connection between your outer and inner life."

"Is it not the same law," replied the mulatto, smiling, "that presses upon me and you, and all beings on earth? The law of necessity! Good strives for good, because it cannot do otherwise, the evil will be evil, for that is it born. How can it be corrected but by the rough, powerful hand of Life, which has so often corrected it already? I look often with a thousand pangs upon the blood which is spilt, upon this poor, misused land: I shudder at the dreadful truth. But then a secret voice tells me it must be so, the horrible crimes which have here been committed for centuries, can no otherwise be avenged, the holy flame of liberty will rise out of this blood; virtue, yes, my friend, virtue which for centuries has dwelt only in the hearts of exalted, God-aspiring individuals, will come with the banners of freedom, and emancipate the nations of the earth. This thought makes us strong and mighty to endure, like faith in God. O! what are the consolations of religion to the certainty of this wisdom."

"And if this thought should delude you, my dear friend," said Antonina, "if this lofty virtue, for which you live, should prove nothing but a dream of divinity, which the human race, poor, forsaken and forever tortured by passions and sufferings, will never be able to realize."

Petion shook his head, with a smile, and then casting one earnest look upon her, he cried: "Will you rob me of the very stay of my existence, O! cruel friend, know you not that the goddess I worship, already requires of me costly sacrifices enough? My heart is as fiery as another's, this heavenly repose, this sunset asks me, why I am so lonely and sad? I would gladly rest upon a loving heart, but ah! it belongs to another. What comforts me, what gives me strength, composure, and a higher life? It is the thought of a future, for which I may live and endure, and when my heart bleeds, when I tremblingly ask myself, why may I not be happy like so many others? then the divinity within me, cries: I will reward thee, forget what thou hast lost, be true. I will come and thy hand shall be mine."

He silently rose up, and in silence departed. Antonina neither looked after him nor called him back. Her wet eye turned to the huge fire-ball which was now descending into a sea of flames. Tears rolled unchecked down her cheeks. She rose and looked around with a devout animation. The forests glowed, over the sky flowed a stream of many-coloured splendour, the little waves seemed like gold, and all the trees, bushes, and rocks, and the whole far scene, even the gloomy mornes changed continually with rosy and burning colours, and arose almost transparent into the pure light of heaven.

"My poor, dear friend!" murmured she, softly, "this heavenly glory belongs to thee; ah! the earth will never reward thee."

A light laugh startled her, and when she looked round, Jumecourt stood at her side. He embraced her with passionate violence, whispering: "Here I am, Antonina, at the setting of the sun, punctual to your command. What prated the cursed enthusiast about virtue, my beautiful love, knows he not that we two have sworn death to all virtue?"

Antonina struggled a moment with his greater strength, and then tore her hand away from him, and in the violence of her indignation, struck him quite a heavy blow. "M. de Jumecourt," said she, then, coolly and contemptuously, "they have told me much of your thoughtlessness and insolence, but I have heard you praised also as a man of sense. Of the first I have now myself had plain proof, but the last I have found a lie, for otherwise you would never have dared to renew your foolish jests with me."

She was about to hasten away, but Jumecourt held her fast. "Stop! my beauty," cried he, "the time is too short, we must seek out a place where we may discuss the laws of honour and virtue."

"Wretch!" cried she, "off from me. Help, Petion!" At this moment half-a-dozen black figures rushed out of the bushes, and in a few seconds a thick cloth was thrown over her mouth and her hands tied.

"How now, Madame?" cried Jumecourt, laughing. "Keep yourself quiet and no harm shall happen to you. Romaine-la-prophetesse"—here his voice ceased, for the Griffon stood behind him with an axe in hand, swung high in the air. One heavy blow, and Jumecourt was felled to the earth without a sound. The slave pushed the body aside with a horrible laugh, and tore the musket from Jumecourt's hand, he then raised the axe anew, but suddenly turned and sprang after his companions, down the hill, for Petion appeared with the old Ramiro, approaching from the shrubbery of the plantation.

"Was not that a man, a negro?" cried Petion, alarmed. He hastened towards the free, and before him lay a bloody, lifeless body.

"Antonina!" shouted the agonized Ramiro, "my child, here is help!"

"Petion bent down to the body, and as he recognized it, a suspicion of what had happened broke upon him. "Take care of this man, M. Ramiro," said he, "he does not appear to be quite dead, I trust to bring back your daughter."

In a few moments, all the men on the plantation were in full pursuit. The shaggy, Spanish blood-hounds, caught the track of the fugitives, and soon they were heard baying in the woods in chase of their black game.

(End of the First Volume.)

THE LITTLE MATCH GIRL.—A CHRISTMAS STORY.

BY THE DANISH POET, ANDENSON.

It was so terribly cold; it snowed, and the evening began to be dark: it was also the last evening in the year, New-Year's eve. On this cold, dark evening, a poor little girl went into the street with bare head and naked feet. It is true she had shoes on when she went from home, but of what use were they? They were very large shoes, her mother had last worn them, they were too large; and the little one had lost them in hurrying over the street as two carriages passed quickly by. One shoe was not to be found, and the other a boy ran away with, saying he could use it for a cradle when he had children himself. The little girl now went on with her small naked feet, which were red and blue with cold; she carried a number of matches in an old apron, and held one bundle in her hand. No one had bought of her the whole day, no one had given her a farthing. Poor thing! she was hungry and benumbed with cold, and looked so downcast! The snow-flakes fell on her yellow hair, which curled so prettily round her neck, but she did not heed that.

The lights shone from all the windows, and there was such a delicious smell of the roast beef in the street; it was New-Year's eve, and she thought of that!

She sat down in a corner between two houses; the one stood a little more forward in the street than the other; and drew her legs up under her to warm herself, but she was still colder, and she durst not go home; she had not sold any matches, or got a single farthing! Her father would beat her; and it was also cold at home, they had only the roof directly over them, and there the wind whistled in, although straw and rags were stuffed in the largest crevices.

Her little hands were almost benumbed with cold. Ah! a little match might do some good, durst she only draw one out of the bundle, strike it on the wall, and warm her fingers. She drew out one match! how it burned! it was a warm clear flame, like that of a little candle, when she held her hand round it; it was a strange light!

The little girl thought she sat by a large iron stove with brass balls on the top; the fire burned so nicely and warmed so well! Nay, what was that? The little girl stretched out her feet to warm them, too; when the flame went out, the stove vanished, she sat with a burnt match in her hand. Another was struck, it burned, it shone; and where the light fell on the wall it became as transparent as crape; she looked directly into the room, where the roasted goose, stuffed with apples and prunes, steamed so charmingly on the table which was laid out, and covered with a shining white cloth, and fine porcelain service. What was still more splendid, the goose sprang off the dish and waddled along the floor, with knife and fork in its back: it came directly up to the poor girl. Then the match went out, and there was only the thick, cold wall to be seen.

She struck another match. Then she sat under the most charming Christmas tree; it was still larger and more ornamental than that she had seen throught the glass door at the rich merchant's, the last Christmas; a thousand candles burned on the green branches; and motley pictures, like those which ornament the shop windows, looked down at her. The little girl lifted up both hands, then the match was extinguished, the many Christmas candles rose higher and higher: she saw that they were bright stars: one of them fell, and made a fiery stripe in the sky. "Now one dies!" said the poor girl, for old grandmother, who had alone been kind to her, but who was now dead, had told her that when a star falls, a soul goes up to God!

She again struck a match against the wall, it shone all around, and her old grandmother stood in the lustre, so shining, so mild and blissful. "Grandmother," exclaimed the little girl, "oh! take me with you! I know you will be gone away when the match goes out, like the warm stove, the delicious roast goose, and the delightful Christmas tree!" and she struck in haste the whole remainder of the matches that was in the bundle; she would not lose sight of grandmother, and the matches shone with such brilliancy that it was clearer than in broad daylight. Grandmother had never before looked so pretty, so great; she lifted the poor little girl up in her arms, and they flew so high, so high in splendour and joy, there was no cold, no hunger, no anxiety; they were with God.

But the little girl sat in the corner by the house, in the cold morning hour, with red cheeks, and with a smile round her mouth, dead, frozen to death, the last evening of the old year.

New-Year's morning rose over the little corpse as it sat with the matches, of which a bundle was burned. But no one knew what beautiful things she had seen, in what splendour and gladness she had entered with her old grandmother into New-Year's Joys.

A singular sect, that we have never heard of before, is thus described in the report of a recent sermon, by the Rev. Mr. Miller, in the Express. In one respect, we think they would suit a friend of ours, who, in sewing on the buttons of a set of shirts for her brother, said, that if she should ever be married, *he*—that is the husband that might be—should wear hooks and eyes:

"The Omischites must be one of the most singular denominations of Christians in the world. The church originated in Holland, and was founded, in the sixteenth century, by a man named Jacob Omie, who had previously been a most zealous Menanize. This singular sect have gradually increased in numbers up to the present time; and whole districts of them may now be found in the interior of Pennsylvania, Ohio, and Indiana. The reason that so little is known about them is, that they are never allowed to attend other churches, and never allow others to attend their own, and it is said that Mr. Miller is the only seceder from that church in this country. The following are some of the peculiarities of this people: Their clothing is always home made, and their coats, destitute of collars, are fastened by hooks and eyes, instead of buttons; they also wear broad-brimmed hats, and long beards, and in every particular, dress much more plainly than the Quakers.—The women also dress very plainly, but the reverend gentleman omitted to go into particulars, on account of the delicacy of the subject. But, he added, to depart from the above modes of dress, was considered a breach of the religion, and was severely punished. They worship but one hour in the week, and that is on Sunday, between nine and ten o'clock, after which, the day is devoted to amusement.—They invariably sing two hymns, and have one discourse. After the psalm is done, he asks the congregation how they liked the sermon; when one of the old fathers invariably answers—'Yes, we are well pleased.' Sermons are never found fault with among this people. The despise everything like learning, and interpret the Scriptures very much after the manner of other heathen. They have no churches, but their dwellings are used for that purpose; and, while the religious services are going on, it is customary for about half-a-dozen women to be preparing a sumptuous feast, in the way of soup, and bread and butter. Their preachers are elected by ballot, and whomsoever is elected, is compelled to officiate. When a member of this church is guilty of any offence, he is expelled, not only from this church, but from the bosom of his family. They are great haters of the Irish, and look upon every Paddy as a near relative of the Devil. They never suffer their children to go to school, and consider themselves the only true Christians on the earth."

Gleanings from Foreign Papers.

THE NEW GAME OF "FRENCH AND ENGLISH."

Lord Brougham, it is said, is fond of hearing himself talk. We confess that we like to hear him talk too—whenever he talks as follows. Mettraye, we should premise, is a school for the reformation of convict children:

"It was to the honour of the sister kingdom, that the French Government had aided the Mettraye Institution by grants of money, it being partly supported by the labour of the convicts themselves. They had also founded twelve similar institutions in other parts of France, in consequence of the great success that had attended that in Mettraye. If he had a feeling of rivalry with respect to France—if he had any national feeling, it led him to envy the French Government, far more for having established such institutions, than for all their colonies in Algeria—than all their Spanish marriages—than all the glory of Napoleon and Turenne, against which he would set the brighter glory of his noble friend who sat near him (the Duke of Wellington). He hoped and prayed that they might think only of the rivalry he had mentioned, and that the trifling quarrels and trumpery objections they had lately heard of, would give way to subjects of greater interest and importance."

Thus, according to the *Times'* report, spoke Lord Brougham, the other evening, in the House of Lords. Bravo, Henry! Since there must, of course, always exist some feeling of rivalry between France and England, we hope that it will assume the form which his Lordship desiderates. We shall then endeavour to cut out French penitentiaries instead of French fleets, and it will be our national boast, that one of our own schoolmasters is equal to three of our neighbours'. We shall mutually vie in teaching the young idea to shoot—without a musket. Our war-cry will be "Up, scholars, and at them!" We shall alter, not abolish, a favourite pastime of the Old School. The game of "French and English" will be played—with a difference—in the New.—*Punch.*

An Affair of Honour.—The following gem of correspondence has been published in the Paris and London papers:

"Sir: You insulted me the other day in the Chamber of Deputies. Free to-day from all business engagements, I send to you my friend, M. Viennet, Peer of France, President of the Society of Men of Letters, to learn the day, the place, and the hour, (we give the conclusion in the original French, lest it might be supposed we exaggerated,) *ou il vous convient que nous couperons la gorge.*

ALEXANDER DUMAS,
Marquis de la Pailleterie."

To this strange epistle the sensible M. de Maleville sent the following amusing answer:

"Sir: I thank you for having afforded me the opportunity of seeing the agreeable and excellent M. Viennet. As to the proposal which you are good enough to make to cut my throat, I am chagrined beyond measure at not being able to accept it. I have not the honour to be a gentleman.

Marquis de MALEVILLE.

It is recorded that by an ancient act of the good old Scottish Parliament, passed in the reign of Margaret, in the year about 1288, it was:

"*Orderit*, that during ye reign of her maist blessed majestie, ilka maiden ladee, of baith high and low estait, shall hae liberty to speak to ye man she likes. Gif he refuses to take her to be his wife, he shall be mulct in the sum of an hundrity pends, or less, as his estait may be, except and always, gif he can make it appear that he is betrothit to another woman, then he shall be free."

Found out.—A certain notable housewife had observed that her stock of pickled cockles were running remarkably low, and she spoke to the cook accordingly. The cook's character was at stake; unwilling to give warning with such an imputation upon her honesty, she, nevertheless, felt that all confidence between her mistress and herself was at an end. One day the jar containing the pickles being placed as usual on the dresser, while she was engaged in basting a joint before the fire, she happened to turn suddenly round, and beheld, to her great indignation, a favourite magpie, perched on its side, and dipping its beak down the open neck with every symptom of gratification. The mystery was explained—the thief detected. Grasping the ladle of scalding grease which she held in her hand, the exasperated lady dashed the whole contents over the hapless pet, accompanied by the exclamation, "Oh, oh! you've been at the pickled cockles, have ye?" Poor mag, of course, was dreadfully burnt; most of his feathers came off, leaving his little round pate, which had caught the principal part of the volley, entirely bare. The poor bird moped about, lost all his spirit, and never spoke for a year. At length when he had pretty well recovered, and was beginning to chatter again, a gentleman called at the house, who, on taking off his hat, discovered a very bald head! The magpie, who was in the room, appeared evidently struck by the circumstance, hopping upon the back of his chair, he looked him hastily over, and suddenly exclaimed in the ear of the astonished visitor, "Oh, oh! you've been at the pickled cockles, have ye?"

From the Hampshire Herald.

RUGGLES'S NORTHAMPTON WATER-CURE.

We last week visited the Water-Cure Establishment at Bensonville in this town,—and were gratified with an opportunity of examining the whole establishment in all its parts from top to bottom; and hence are able to testify concerning it.

This is the first new building that has been exclusively erected for hydropathic purposes in this country, and it is said by those who have visited other kindred establishments, to be the most commodious and complete. It is thirty-six by seventy feet, two and a half stories high, with separate parlours, bathing and dressing rooms for ladies and gentlemen.—All the baths are supplied with an abundance of pure spring water. There are twenty lodging rooms, each well ventilated, calculated and furnished for two lodgers. There is also a ventilator through the roof of the building. It is regarded by scientific men as admirably calculated for the business.

Whatever may be the views of medical men of Mr. Ruggles's singular mode of practice; judging of symptoms by the sense of touch—detecting the character of diseases by the condition of the skin, invalids award to him the credit of accurately describing their symptoms; *and many who suffer from diseased lungs go to be examined by him before venturing the water treatment at home, or at